

# THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 1.—JANUARY—1919.

## I.

### THE ROMAN CENTURION—A CHARACTER- STUDY.<sup>1</sup>

E. E. KRESGE.

My message to you will be on the Roman Centurion, the man at whose unique faith and virile character Jesus marvelled. The man was not a Christian by profession, but he was thoroughly Christian in spirit. He was not a member of the orthodox church, but he was a citizen of the Kingdom of God. He was the incarnation of the spirit that we should aim to develop in our churches and our schools. The most commonly recognized characteristic of the man was his faith in Jesus Christ as Lord of the spirit world. He did not question for a moment that Jesus had the same absolute authority over the spirits of the unseen world that he had over his troops in Capernaum. Jesus was astonished at such an example of faith from such an unexpected source; and he turned to those who were with him and said: "I have not found such great faith in all Israel." But in thinking of this man we have been in the habit of overlooking some other characteristics which, to me, seem quite as remarkable as his faith in the

<sup>1</sup> Opening sermon of the Spiritual Conference, Lancaster, Pa., July 22, 1918.

*Lordship of Jesus.* It is about these other remarkable qualities of his character that I want to speak to you for a little while this evening.

We find this centurion to have been a man who was free from three very common prejudices which have held the mass of mankind in their vulgar grip from time immemorial. He was, first of all, free from *class prejudice*. He had risen above that iniquitous class feeling from which mankind has suffered so much. He had a slave it is true. In fact he owned a bond slave, a "doulos," who did not have the legal right to his life or his limbs. He very likely had a number of such slaves. In this respect he was like the rest of the upper-class Romans of his day. Slaves were part of their personal property quite as much as horses and cattle. But this centurion was altogether unlike the rest of his fellow Romans in that he was free from prejudice against his slave. He lived in an age of intense class feeling. Inequality of rights and privileges was recognized by the Roman system of religion and education. That noble Roman, the elder Cato, who has always been recognized as a model man, taught that slaves had no rights that a free man had to respect. Even so great and good a man as Marcus Aurelius declared it to be beneath the dignity of a free man to show any concern for the welfare and the happiness of a slave. Tradition informs us that one of the Roman nobility, who lived about this time, cut up a number of his slaves during a meat famine to feed the fish in his private ponds. There was neither statute law nor public sentiment in the Roman empire against such an inhuman act.

Such was the universal feeling against slaves, or the class of toilers, in the great Roman empire of that day. But this centurion did not share this vulgar prejudice with his fellow Romans. On the contrary, he cared for his slave. He was deeply concerned about his welfare and his comfort. He respected his rights as a human being, and treated him like a brother, in spite of the fact that he owned him body and soul. When his slave became ill he did all that he could to make him

comfortable. When he became critically ill he summoned all the aid possible to save his life. And when Capernaum could furnish no more help he summoned the Great Physician, Jesus Christ. And it was not from selfish motives,—not merely because his slave represented a certain money value,—that he tried to save his life. Other Romans, no doubt, tried to save their slaves for the same reason that they would try to save a valuable horse. If this one would die another one would have to be purchased, and that would cost money. But this centurion did not send for Jesus to heal his sick slave from this mercenary motive. He valued the slave's life more than the profit from his labor. He wanted to save him because he loved him,—because the slave was dear to him. The Greek word for dear is strong. The slave was *very dear* to him. He called him my servant, and he also called him *my boy*. In this respect this centurion, though only a Roman soldier, was different from any one whom Jesus had met in that age of universal class prejudice. No wonder that Jesus marvelled at so rare a man.

This noble spirit, which respects the inalienable rights of the under-men, has been one of the most imperative needs of society from that distant day down to the present day. No country ever freed its slaves until there were enough free citizens with the spirit of this centurion. No community ever elevated its submerged classes until there was a sufficient number of men who felt that slaves were men, and that they had rights which must be respected. One of the outstanding needs of our own day is men like this centurion. Class prejudice still divides the Orient into castes, and places the heel of the one caste upon the neck of the other. Class prejudice is one of the insuperable barriers to social progress in the Orient. And it still exists among us here in America. This primitive feeling, which we have inherited from our animal ancestry, still divides our communities into classes who do not love each other. On the one hand we have the rich reveling in their ill-gotten luxuries, and on the other the poor famishing in their

poverty. On the one hand are the toiling masses with no leisure, and on the other the leisure classes with no toil. On the one hand are the laborers clamoring for their rights, and on the other their employers contending for their privileges. And all of you know as well as I do that the one class is prejudiced against the other.

Among the most grave problems that are begging for solution to-day are those that have been created by the class struggles, and which have been intensified by the accompanying class prejudice. There might never have been any class struggles, and consequently no class problems and no class prejudice, if all of the over-men would have manifested the big-brother spirit toward the under-men that this centurion showed toward his slave. But our over-men have not all been animated by the centurion's spirit. The class problems, intensified by class prejudice, are with us and must be solved; and their solution should come down from above,—from men like this centurion,—from men who are big enough and noble enough to sympathize with the down-fallen and the down-trodden, and who will help them to their rightful share of the happiness of life. We need more men like this centurion, who feel towards the submerged classes like a father feels toward a son. We need more men who feel that the man who blackens our boots, and the woman who sweeps our kitchen, has a soul, and that the souls of these people are worth more than our own creature comforts. We need more employers who feel that their employees are human beings like themselves, and that their life is worth more than big dividends. If salvation for the submerged classes will not come down from above, through the sympathetic ministry of noble men like the centurion, it will come from below, from the submerged classes themselves, and in a way that we may not like. To develop men with the spirit of the centurion is one of the paramount tasks of the Christian church.

This Roman soldier was not only free from class prejudice; but he was also free from *race prejudice*. The delegation of



influential Jews, who went to interview Jesus in behalf of the sick slave, said: "The man is worthy that thou shouldst do this for him, for he loveth our nation." "*He loveth our nation.*" No wonder that Jesus marvelled at the man. It was indeed a rare thing, if not an altogether unheard of thing in that day, for a man of one race to be free from prejudice against the people of another race. It was an age of universal race prejudice. The Greeks called all other people barbarians, and treated them as such. The Romans denied all other races equal rights and privileges with themselves. And the Jews called all other people gentiles, or unclean, and thoroughly despised them. Race prejudice had divided the ancient world into sections, and had set the one section against the other. It had inspired innumerable wars, and deluged the world with human blood. It incited the ancient Amalekites against the Moabites, and the Moabites against the Caananites, and the Caananites against the Hittites, and the Semites against all the others and all the others against the Semites. No wonder that Jesus was astonished when he was suddenly confronted by a man who was free from this ungodly prejudice,—a Roman soldier, who actually loved the Jewish people.

It was no clever deception that he practised on those Jews. It was not a mere politician's courtesy that he showed them in order to win their good will for the time being. He actually loved his Jewish neighbors. The delegation that went to see Jesus was not mistaken about that. There is no other possible ground on which you can explain the fact that the Jews, who were bitterly prejudiced against the Romans, loved this man. They loved him and plead his cause, because he first loved them. Well may Jesus have been amazed at finding a man who was free from that racial animosity from the curse of which that ancient world suffered more than it did from plague or pestilence.

And not only did the ancient world suffer from the blighting curse of race prejudice; but the world of to-day is suffering from it still. Race prejudice has beclouded our Christian

sense of the universal brotherhood of mankind. In the church we have been praying: "Our Father who art in heaven," which implies that we are brothers to all of whom he is the Father; but on the street and in the shop we have been despising and shunning the man the color of whose skin and the texture of whose hair differ from our own. Race prejudice is one of the evils that has been preventing the closer federation of the nations. It is one of the things that has been standing in the way of abiding peace on the earth. It was one of the remote causes of the great world-war which has deluged the whole world with suffering, and crimes, and horrors such as had never been known before. The Slav has always been prejudiced against the Teuton, and the Teuton against the Slav; the Saxon against the Teuton and the Slav, and the Teuton and the Slav against the Saxon. And still more race prejudice will be one of the baneful consequences of the war. It will require several generations to live down the deep-seated racial animosity that is being engendered by both the enemy and the allies through the systematic propaganda of hate that is being carried on.

There is imperative need to-day of men like the centurion. There is a clarion call for men who are influential in the world's life and thought who have risen above this primitive racial animosity. The men who will gather around the peace table in Versailles should not have their vision beclouded by any kind of prejudice. The justice, which world-reconstruction demands, requires the leadership of men who have emerged from the past unprejudiced, and who can view the future unselfishly. Our age needs presidents and kings, statesmen and business men, preachers and educators, who are free from prejudice against the people of other countries,—men who are citizens of the world,—men who are wise enough to see that the good and the happiness of each depends upon the good and the happiness of all. We need a new type of patriotism,—one that is not hemmed in by such and such mountains and rivers, or bounded by such and such degrees of latitude and

longitude,—but one that is international and interracial. It is, to say the least, a sad indictment of the civilization of the Christian nations that a programme of military preparedness must be resorted to to keep them from rending each other like infuriated, self-seeking beasts. Abiding peace among the different races and nations will not come until there will be a sufficient number of men in state and church who are as big, as noble, and as Christian in spirit as this pagan Roman soldier was.

And, in the third place, we find this remarkable man free even from *religious prejudice*,—from that narrowness and bigotry which has been so characteristic of religious people all through history and the wide world over. The delegation of orthodox elders from Capernaum, who came to see Jesus, said: "This man himself built us our synagogue." The man was very likely still a despised heathen. There is no evidence that he had become a proselyte to the Jewish religion. But he appreciated the good he saw in this new type of religion, and he was not too bigoted to show it in a very substantial way.

Indeed there is no wonder that Jesus marvelled at so unique a man. It is no common thing to find a man of one religious faith who is altogether free from prejudice against the people of other faiths. Religion ought to make us free from the narrowing, dwarfing influence of vulgar prejudice. It ought to make us all one as Jesus so earnestly prayed that we should be. It ought to unite the different races of mankind in one great brotherhood; but it has failed to do it. The fact is that we are scarcely narrower and more bigoted in any of our feelings than we are in our religious prejudices. It has divided Christendom into a multitude of warring sects, whose chief concern seems to be to perpetuate their illegitimate existence. It has been the cause of unpardonable wars. It has attempted to intimidate earnest seekers after the truth. It has imprisoned and burned at the stake men who dared to think for themselves. It has divided peaceful communities, and has set neighbor against neighbor. It has invaded peaceful homes,

and has set husband against wife, and parent against child. Prejudice between the different denominations and sects is to-day keeping the Christian forces of the community and the nation from coördinating their efforts to redeem society. Religious bigotry has been one of the great barriers to the real progress of the Kingdom of God on earth.

We need more men like the centurion,—men who see the value of religion for struggling humanity; but who see that religion is not a matter of priests and ritual, but of brotherhood and unselfish service, and who are big enough to recognize that spirit as the only true badge of orthodoxy whether found in Jew or Gentile, Catholic or Protestant, in the church or outside of it. Religion is to help us fill the world with big men like the centurion, men who are free from class prejudice and race prejudice; but a religion that is bigoted and intolerant cannot do it.

Such a man then was this centurion at the uniqueness of whose faith and character Jesus marvelled. He is the type of man we must aim to develop in the church and the nation. In the degree that we fail in this, we fail in our chief duty. The number of new churches that we may build, or the number of new converts that we may win, or the amount of money that we may raise for our religious programme cannot atone for our failure to cultivate great and noble souls.

And now as we behold the man on that exalted plane above *class prejudice*, and *race prejudice*, and *religious bigotry*, the question arises in our minds: how did he get there? What forces entered into the making of so unique a character? What were the factors that raised him from the low moral level of the ordinary Roman soldier to that lofty plane where he became the admiration of Jesus Christ, and where we admire him still?

I realize how difficult it is to lay bare a human soul, and to expose the mysterious forces that enter into its culture. I am keenly aware of the difficulty of making a psychological analysis of the forces that enter into the making of character.

But of this one thing we can rest assured: *this remarkable man was not the mere product of heredity and environment.*

Up until a decade or two ago we had been hearing a great deal about *heredity*. A certain class of moralists and educators explained life entirely in terms of heredity. They were reminding us that we are merely the ghosts of our ancestors. This thought was the burden of many a drama like Ibsen's *Ghosts*, and the conclusion of many a learned lecture and article. Men like Professor Galton and his followers told us that life is nothing more than what the pre-natal neural structure makes of it. Each individual clock is made of a certain grade of stuff, and is all wound up before birth, and what we call life is only the volitionless running out of the clock.

To-day we hear very little about heredity, but very much about *environment*. Life is being defined entirely in terms of environment. Not only our physical life, but our mental and moral life as well, is claimed to be solely the product of our environment. All life is defined as a neural action and reaction to our environmental stimulation. Heredity, it is allowed, may predispose us to react more readily to some stimuli than to others. But after all is said that can be said, every phenomenon of life, physical, mental, and moral, is claimed to be simply a mechanical reaction to something in our environment. Everything depends upon the atmosphere in which the clock runs itself out. These men would regenerate the human race from the circumference inward. They would develop a nobler race of men by simply giving us a better environment. Nothing else is deemed necessary. All that we need to grow fine roses are healthy bulbs, good soil, good weather conditions, and proper physical care. All that we need to grow fine animals are good stock, clean stables, plenty of good food and proper care. Given these things and the desired results will follow of necessity. The radical advocates of this theory would develop men like the centurion by proper environmental stimulation and unclogged neural reaction to it.

No one who is interested in the welfare of the human race can afford to disregard the truth, or the half-truth, which these men of the laboratory have taught us. We must recognize the truth of eugenics. Much does depend upon the stuff from which the clock is made. There is something in the mysterious human clock work that is wound up for us before birth. We are predisposed by the accidents of birth to react more readily to some stimuli and less readily to others. No one who understands human nature would deny that much in our life, even in our mental and moral life, is a mere mechanical reaction to the accidental stimulation of our environment. I am quite ready to admit that a certain class of people are almost entirely the product of their environment. I can readily agree with Mr. Jacob Riis that the immorality of the slums is 99 per cent. environment. He is altogether correct when he says that we must wipe out the slums before we can regenerate the people of the slums. Herbert Spencer once said that golden conduct cannot come from leaden instincts; but nobody knew better than Mr. Spencer that leaden instincts are often the product of the leaden stuff from which the clock is made, and the leaden environment in which it runs itself out. I would not undertake to dispute the claim that the average man of the average community is 75 per cent. environment. All of us, if we could only know it, are what we are very largely because we were reared in good, clean homes, and among good, clean associates, and were educated in a moral and liberalizing atmosphere. The modern preacher must recognize the great importance of eugenics and environment in the culture of souls as well as in the culture of bodies.

But when all is said that can be said in recognition of the importance of environment and the predisposing bias of heredity it must be remembered with all seriousness that we cannot explain all there is to life in these terms. I said, a moment ago, that we cannot explain the unique character of the centurion in terms of *heredity* and *environment*. By birth he was a heathen, predisposed to the appalling immoralities



which the paganism of the ancient world carried with it. By profession he was a Roman soldier, daily in contact with the low standards of morality so characteristic of the Roman soldiery. By heredity and environment he was predisposed to class prejudice, and race hatred, and irreligion. But this man did not react mechanically along the line of least resistance as the advocates of culture by environment assume that we always do.

How then shall we explain him? We cannot explain him with any degree of satisfaction unless we take into account his *will-to-be-good*. There are three great laws of life; *heredity*, which furnishes us with the raw material; *environment*, which moulds and shapes the raw material in accordance with certain general principles; and the *will*, which gives the whole individuality and fills it with moral content. The unique character of the centurion had its roots in his will-to-be-good. The ultimate secret of every unique character must be sought in the will. Without reference to the will we cannot explain any unique individual. A really great and noble individual creates his environment more than the environment makes him. There is a difference between the cultivation of fine roses, or fine animals, and the culture of noble men. The latter can never be accomplished apart from the will-to-be-good. It is the will, therefore, that must receive the primal emphasis in all our efforts to cultivate noble souls. Everything else that we may do will, from a moral point of view, go to waste until we have reached a man's will and have stimulated the desire to be good. If a man wills to be bad there is nothing in the universe of God that can make him good. So long as a man wills to be bad you may improve his environment, and you may educate him, but he will be a bad man still. So long as a man does not will to be good you may baptize him with the holiest water in the universe;—you may place upon his head the holy hands of the holiest bishop of Christendom;—you may indoctrinate him in all the ancient creeds of the church;—and you may feed him with a thousand holy

wafers, and he will be unholy still. We have tried too long to make men good by a process of holy magic, and we have tried too little to stimulate men's wills. There is real danger at the present time that we may pass to the opposite extreme where we will depend too much upon the salutary effects of mere social service, and the mere improvement of the external environment. The modern preacher will be guilty of an unpardonable error if he will depend upon sacramental magic to do what science has proven can be accomplished only by the transforming power of the law of environment. But he will be guilty of a still more unpardonable error if he will be unmindful of the fact that, so far as morality is concerned, everything else that we may be able to do will go to waste until we have reached the will-to-be-good. Eugenics and every form of social service can, from the moral point of view, do no more than make it easier and more natural for the will to be good. The ultimate end and aim, therefore, of all our preaching and teaching, and of all our efforts to make men good, whether in the church or outside of it, must be to reach the will and stimulate it to be good. Morality can strike root in no other soil. Men become noble in no other way than by the will to be so.

It should be noted, finally, that, in addition to a good will, this centurion also had the good sense to reach out after the best in his environment, and that he possessed the religious faith that reached up to his God and accepted the help which religion offered him. There is every indication that he believed in the gods of the Romans before he came to Palestine, and that he reached out after the best that the pagan religion could offer him. When he came to live among the Jews he recognized the good there was in their religion, and, like Cornelius, he reached out after the best in the new religion. And now that he discovered Jesus Christ he reached out to him with a faith so simple and so strong that it astonished the great Master of men.

*The will-to-be-good* then is the absolutely indispensable starting point to nobility of character; but it is not sufficient of

itself. The *will-to-be-good* must be supplemented by the practical wisdom that reaches out after the best in the best of environments, and by the religious faith that reaches up to God. I know of no other way to those sublime heights where the centurion stood,—where Jesus marvelled at him, and where we marvel at him still.

ALLENTOWN, PA.

## II.

### THE GOSPEL'S GREATEST PARADOX: AN EXPLANATION.

CHARLES EDWARD MEYERS.

The paradox referred to in the title of this essay is the thirty-fourth verse of the tenth chapter of the Gospel by St. Matthew: "*Think not that I am come to send peace on earth, I came, not to send peace, but a sword.*"

Of the many unique, epigrammatic statements of truth to which our Saviour gave expression, this is one of the most astounding. It is not too much to assume that if the audience to which it was spoken had been a general one instead of the intimate company of his disciples, the same thing might have happened that took place on at least one other occasion, when, Jesus having said something especially revolutionary, the Jews took up stones to drive him out of the temple court. On first consideration one shrinks from associating it at all with Jesus in any sense whatever. Coming as a climax in a series of what appear to be the harshest and most enigmatical sayings accredited to him in the gospel narratives, it is apparently so inconsistent with his spirit, so inconsistent with our best conceptions of his character, that one would fain believe it an interpolation. Standing as we do, at this season of the church year, just midway between the festival of the nativity and the festival of the resurrection, we are not yet so far removed from the former but that we may still hear the echoes of the Christmas bells ringing to the world the glad, good news of "*Peace on earth, good-will to men,*" while we look forward to the message of the Easter bells: "*My peace I give unto you; my peace I leave with you; not as the world giveth give I unto you.*" How can we harmonize the whole accepted gospel-

characterization of Jesus, the non-resistent Galilean, who unequivocally repudiated the law of retaliation as contrary to the nature of God, and whose spirit of humble submission forbade defense of even a felon's death; how can we harmonize the representation of him as the "*Prince of Peace*" with this statement of his "*I came not to bring peace on the earth, but a sword*"! If this text means what it says, one's first impulse, I say, is to pass it by. If a definite answer must be had in his own words to the question of Jesus' mission, our preference, surely, is for one of his many other statements—one of milder, sweeter terms,—perchance that one in which he said: "*I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.*"

Quite on the contrary, however, there need be no hesitancy to accept this strange assertion of the Master at its literal meaning. Startling as it is, when viewed in the light of his character, there are few of Jesus' prophecies that have found a more abundant fulfillment. In a very real sense Jesus brought a sword into the world; and to recognize the fact of it is in no wise to compromise his sublime distinction as the "*Prince of Peace*."

But what did Jesus mean by this prophecy? You will recall that at the time he gave expression to it he was instructing his disciples to assist him in his work. He had taken them aside for a brief while and was preparing them to go out, in the near future, to preach the gospel. He was preparing them to minister to the poor and the sick and the sinful and to proclaim to all, in word and deed, that the kingdom of heaven was at hand. He told them what preparation to make for their tours from city to city. He told them how to conduct themselves in the homes of the inhospitable. He told them how to prepare spiritually for the deliverance of their message. He told them whom they should fear. He told them how implicitly they should trust their heavenly father. But above all else, and at greatest length, he told them what they might expect in the way of personal experience. They were not to

go forth in the illusion that, endowed with power though they were, they were going to be gloriously, even encouragingly successful. He told them frankly that the biggest thing in their experience would be opposition. "*The disciple is not above his Master,*" he told them, "*nor the servant above his Lord. It is enough for the disciple to be as his master, and the servant as his Lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?*" In contrast with their confident hopes and much to their disappointment, I imagine, he told them that not only would the message which they had to preach not be a generally acceptable message, but that it would beget downright, bitter conflict. "Preach the kingdom of heaven," he told them, "but do not be surprised, if, instead of ministering joy and peace and calling forth among men faith and hope and brotherly love, you stir up such enmity and strife as will set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother." The ultimate purpose of the gospel is the kingdom of heaven, but incidentally in the nature of the case, the preliminary by-product of its proclamation is a sword. In other words, preëminently above the specific, detachable, more or less comprehensive expressions of truth called forth by varying audiences and circumstances, above the ministering to the poor and the sick, and every other service that he could render, the mission of Jesus, after all, was the universal establishment of a well-conceived ideal. Jesus Christ had a very definite ideal of individual personal life. He had a very definite ideal of social life, national and universal; and whatever else he came into the world to do, whatever else may have been the forms of self-expression by which he and his followers of succeeding generations might attract attention and win respect and allegiance to that ideal, with the insight and foresight of the prophet that he was, he recognized that by no means would that ideal of personal life and that ideal of the kingdom of heaven for social life find realization without long, intense, tragical contention. Jesus knew only too well what



was in man. He thoroughly understood that, notwithstanding the unimpeachable disinterestedness of his motive and the righteousness of his cause, the innovation that he preached, striking at the heart of the traditions of the world, and hallowed by ages, would engender antagonisms of the saddest kind. Before men would lay aside the cherished old and assume the new, even though the new came with all the authority of divine revelation, they would antagonize the new and fight against it; with all the passion and selfishness of a carnal order they would make strenuous effort, in some instances not without sincere conviction of its inferiority, to blot it out of the thoughts of men. However benevolent, redemptive and constructive the ideal of Jesus was designed to be in its final issues, the revolutionary nature of its principles could from the outset result by the way only in separating men against men in a struggle for mastery. Persuaded of its truth and ameliorating effectiveness when applied to life, those who believed in the Christ ideal would contend and, if need were, die for it; persuaded of the fallacy of it and observing the growing acceptance of what, in their view, was intolerable heresy, those who could not believe in it would regard it their sacred duty to oppose it. With Judaism on the one hand and heathenism on the other, the appearance of Christianity with its far-reaching possible effects on prevalent standards of individual, national and world life, unsheathed a sword, which, though nineteen centuries have since elapsed, is not yet beaten into a ploughshare or turned into a pruning hook. Certainly Jesus came into the world to establish peace and goodwill among men; and despite many evidences to the contrary Christian faith has no doubt of the surety of the consummation of that purpose. He came into the world to bind mankind together unto the ends of the earth in the bonds of a holy, happy brotherhood; but no one more fully than Jesus himself recognized that such an achievement could not be accomplished in a day—no, not even in a generation. Perhaps he was not persuaded that it might be done in nineteen centuries. He

recognized the laws—nay better the weakness of human nature. He recognized the laws of history. He recognized that God's ways and God's times and God's processes are his own. He did not expect that individual men, much less whole nations, innately inspirited and fixed mentally and morally in the accumulated ideals of ten thousand years of evolution, would throw their hereditary and racial convictions to the winds over night and without raising a protesting hand accept his view of God and man. He knew that men would fight about it in the forum, in the halls of learning, on the battlefield. He knew that men in their materialism and animalism would not come to accept the golden rule and the Sermon on the Mount and the new law of love as norms of conduct without a long, hard struggle. Such idealism as he propounded would not be accepted by the world nor the peace of God wrap the world around without having the pages of its history written red with the tale of the sword. In this sense Jesus never uttered anything more truthful than when he said: "*Think not that I am come to send peace on the earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword.*"

Take first, by way of illustration of its truth, the life of Jesus himself. What did the proclamation of the gospel of peace, the faithful maintenance of his ideal of life before the attention of his generation, mean to Jesus Christ? Whatever else his gospel mission meant to him in terms of peace, in the holy of holies of his own soul, it certainly meant to him in the terms of life experience a keen-edged sword. The fact of the matter is that probably the grandest phase of the heroism of Jesus' character is to be recognized in the sublime disproportion between the sweet serenity of his soul and the outward strife of his daily experience. In the realm within no man's life ever had more peace in it than the life of Jesus, and in all outward relationship and incident no man's life ever had less peace in it than that of the "*Prince of Peace.*" Whether the prophet of a former day had him in mind or not when he said it, there can be no doubt that from day to day in the

conflicts of his contact with men, "*he was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief.*" And if it was not written of him when first it was written, surely it can be written of him now, that "*they looked on him whom they pierced.*" Did any man's life have more in it of what is actually and metaphorically wrapped up in the word sword—more in it of struggle, more of antagonism, more of downright daily fight because of the loftiness of what he believed and taught, because of the gracious unselfishness and benevolence of what he did, because of the genuine nobility of what he was than the life of Jesus? No sooner had he entered upon his public ministry and had become a distinctive figure in national life but he came into direct, uncompromisable conflict with the prevailing ideals and temper of his time. From that moment henceforward, for him it was fight, fight, fight—his conceptions of a human order in keeping with the idea of divine fatherhood against the narrowness and pretensions of the established order. Personally pure and of the most holy integrity of character, he had to cross swords with and fight the devil in the temptations of his own soul that grew out of the transcendent nature of his own idealistic purposes and the well-nigh hopeless futility, at times, of their making the least possible impression on the hard heads and hearts of men. Born of Jewish parentage and brought up in the orthodox atmosphere of a loyal Jewish household, he was put to the necessity, in more than one instance, of being at troublesome issue with his own family. Once at least his brothers and sisters said he was beside himself. The few personal friends that he gathered about him, lovable and faithful as they may appear at times, gave him no end of heartache. One of them was executed for criticizing existing morals before Jesus' own ministry had received much more than casual notice, and in the fate of that one, I have no doubt, Jesus unmistakably read his own fate. His disciples misconceived his character and were disappointed in his achievements, and more than once he had to step in with pathetic reproof to silence their petty

cavils and quarrels and smooth out their jealousies. Representing a new conception of God and a new conception of man he had to fight the rulers of church and state, immovably entrenched in bigotry and caste, and with whom impassiveness, as they well knew, would have meant displacement from authority and leadership and profit. Pharisee and Sadducee and Herodian, never agreeing on anything else before, agreed most heartily and harmoniously to disagree with Jesus Christ and persecute him unto death. Constantly on his heels to entrap him in blasphemy or sedition, he had to take up the sword and fight them. He scourged them out of the temple, he argued with them on the highway and in the synagogue and once at least, with passionate wrath he denounced them a generation of vipers, hypocrites and whited sepulchres. From the ford of the Jordan where John baptized him, and the dove of peace rested upon him to the crest of Golgotha where the mob crucified him and tribulation found surcease in the peace of death, the proclamation of the gospel of peace meant to him who first proclaimed it an incessant clashing of swords. The new and the better, the divine idealism of Jesus had to be fought for and because it was worth fighting for and dying for. The struggle between what Jesus stood for on the one hand and what the world stood for on the other hand had to come as an intermediate result, with all its calamitous issue for Jesus personally, before what he stood for would begin to be effective. He had to be a sword-cursed Christ, before he could be a redeeming Christ. He had to run counter to the world's spirit. The nature of his convictions as these possessed his whole being demanded it. As light antagonizes darkness there was nothing else but for him to antagonize his age. It was love and truth and righteousness with him against selfishness and greed and sin, complete and dominant. Down to the last for Jesus Christ, laying the foundations for the kingdom of heaven among men was a matter of the sword—a matter of chivalrous fighting with unabated zeal. Only when the last breath left his nail-and-spear-wounded body did the din of the

conflict cease for him. His enemies, life-long and implacable, were satisfied. They sheathed their swords; and placing a little guard at the door of Joseph's tomb in case there should be need of a sword to keep the lifeless body within, they went their way in peace. They thought the gospel sword was conquered. Certainly, notwithstanding it meant a great many other things—notwithstanding it meant even peace, the peace of God, the bringing of the gospel and the establishment of its ideal meant a sword to Jesus Christ.

Take as a second illustration of the truth of this prophecy the history of the Christian church. There are those who think that the history of the Christian church, considering its essentially benevolent aim and the divine nature of its authority, is an exceedingly long history. They think that considering the comparatively limited extent to which its ideals have permeated the practical life of the world its history has been too long to prevent some justifiable doubts of their efficacy. Isn't the difficulty with those who take this view that they have forgotten the nature of the church's problem, the nature of the church's adversary? They have forgotten that the progress of Christianity has been a matter of battle from generation to generation, a matter of foes without and foes within. If you want to read peaceful literature, don't read the history of Christianity any more than if you want to read non-tragic biography you would read the life of Jesus. The history of Christianity is a tale of the sword—of the sword that was wielded against it, of the sword that was wielded in its defense, of the sword that was wielded among its own adherents in fratricidal strife. The history of *Christianity* reeks with the odor of martyr fires, of outraged innocence, of persecution and pain and death. It is the history of nineteen hundred years of fighting, and it must be added, of course, not without stain entirely on Christianity's own fair reputation. It has grown up and made the progress that it has made out of conflict and with frequent retrogression, from which with more conflict it had again and again to recover itself. It could not

have been otherwise. Without unsheathing the sword, Christianity would have died a sacrifice on the altars of heathenism in the first century A.D. or swallowed up in Jewish ceremonialism before it had had a chance even of coming into combat with heathenism. Like its divine founder, in the persons of his earlier disciples, Christianity had to take firm hold of its convictions, assert its sublime faith with indubitable positiveness and throw itself into the arena with its competitors. And that much the more necessarily because its competitors, knowing nothing of the spirit of toleration and justification by merit, would not let it go its way in peace. Just as Christianity antagonized its competitors fairly and inoffensively in its ideals of faith and life, so its competitors antagonized it, offensively and physically, and non-resistance was an impossibility. The sword of conflict was an intermediate necessity to its existence and establishment in untrammelled freedom. Surely, when we read this text "*Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword,*" and ask ourselves, what does it mean in the light of the history of Christianity?—it does not require much effort to think of Stephen stoned to death outside the gates of Jerusalem. Christianity was a sword to him. Do we not spontaneously think of St. Paul, "*in stripes above measure, in prison more frequently, in deaths often.*" For St. Paul to take Christianity into Asia Minor and into the Greek and Roman worlds was not a luxurious and peaceful task. At every step he was fought by Roman cruelty and sensuality and Greek intellectualism, than which there never has been any shrewder. It was only the sword of the spirit and the helmet of salvation and the breastplate of righteousness that furnished him adequate equipment for success. And even these, in the world's view, failed him when he lay a bleeding corpse in the Via Sacra. Christianity was a sword to St. Paul. It was a sword to ten thousand Christians in the imperial city when Nero sat upon the throne of the Roman empire. And when that cruel emperor had burned half his



capital and put the blame on the followers of the Nazarene it became a sword to thousands more. Some of them were sawn asunder, some furnished amusement in the gladiatorial ring, devoured by famished beasts to the edification of Roman aristocracy; some, wrapped in pitch, lighted up the streets for those who would enjoy an evening pleasure walk. What was it that became the seed of Christianity but the blood of the martyrs? Recently we celebrated the four-hundredth anniversary of the Reformation. While we recall to what extent the principles established in those days have entered into our modern life structure, we shall miss half the lesson of the Reformation, if we do not recall also the necessary sacrifices entailed in the establishment of those principles. Didn't John Huss go to the stake, because as a Christian, for conscience sake and for the kingdom's sake, he had to antagonize his age? Didn't Christ bring a sword to Europe in the sixteenth century and start such an awful conflict to cleanse his kingdom, as set brother against brother and nation against nation? What was Christianity to Ulric Zwingli dying on the battlefield of Cappel with a paraphrased verse of the tenth chapter of St. Matthew as the last words upon his lips—*"They may kill the body, but they cannot kill the soul"*? What was it to Ridley and Latimer in England? to Titus Coan, to Allen Gardiner? What was it to the missionaries and Chinese Christians in the boxer rebellion? That is the history of Christianity. It is the tale of a sword, the tale of hardship and struggle for Christ's sake. The world has never taken the beautiful peace of Christ without fighting against it. At the very height of his ministry Jesus uttered that pathetic statement, *"ye will not come unto me that ye may have life,"* and at the close of his ministry, with more pathos still, he wept out the words *"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not."* How few are the generations succeeding his own to

which the same characterization will not apply! It has been the spirit of the world ever since. Men will not come to Christ. And that is pathetic indeed. But far more pathetic they antagonize Christ. They set up their own sinful ideals. In heartless selfishness they exploit the poor, and they prey for gain upon the weakness and vices of their brethren. And so the swords are drawn—the sword of the world and the sword of the Christ ideal. Sometimes the world cuts deep and triumphs. But the Christ is eternal. Whichever way the victory incidentally goes, the conflict is only intermediary. His ultimate goal is peace in the kingdom of heaven on earth. Some day he will see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied.

But this prophecy is fulfilled also in the history of Christian civilization. I do not think it can be gainsaid that the best that men have anywhere in the world today in the way of social and political institutions emanated from the life and spirit and moral and religious principles of Jesus Christ. But to make such a statement and let it stand without a certain qualification is to state only half a truth. Beyond the indebtedness of the world to Christian idealism for the formulation of those fundamental conceptions of human relationships that will make for social peace and happiness, have you ever thought to how great a degree men are indebted for the realization of such social and political blessings as they have to the heroic, daring, chivalrous, enduring, suffering, fighting spirit inspired by Christianity? The rights of men as laid down in the broad general principles of the New Testament have not worked themselves into the fabric of the world's organized social life merely on the basis of an enlightening proclamation of their worthiness. There is a great deal more to be said in explanation of the difference between the social relationship of men in Jesus' day and the social relationships of men in our day than that the transformation was brought about by peaceful propaganda. Jesus Christ brought a terrible sword into the world when he essayed to upset men's religious traditions, but he brought a still more terrible sword, when as a result

of his enunciation of the ideal of the kingdom of heaven, with all that that implies, he struck at established political and social institutions. The world has not gotten as far as it has in Christian liberty and justice simply by preaching a Christian brand of politics and governmental organization and trusting to the persuasive power of dialectics and apologetics. Something is due—yes, much is due to the Christ-blessed sword. It is perfectly correct to say with General Sherman that "*war is hell*," but the history of the world undoubtedly shows that without war modern civilization would have been the heir of some things that are worse than war, and the Master knew perfectly well whereof he spoke when he prophesied wars and rumors of wars and men's hearts failing them for fear as preludes to the coming of his kingdom among men on earth. War is most certainly a catastrophe, a grievous misfortune, but there have been times when men's souls have been at stake, when human liberty and human happiness have been in jeopardy, when no price was too dear to pay for the maintenance of sacred privilege. And then it was the duty to gird on the sword and shoulder the musket and march out to fight and die in the spirit of Christian sacrifice. Without that spirit there could be no happiness and no peace. Jesus had to die for what he believed was truth and righteousness and happiness for mankind and sometimes it comes to pass that a hundred thousand men must do the same thing. When he set up among men the ideal of Christian civilization, when he individualized the individual and set at its proper value the personal privilege of the soul to attain its divine destiny in legitimate freedom, he put into the hands of nations of men a justifiable sword. Open the history of modern civilization anywhere you please and you are confronted on every page with the indelible fact that the rights of man as inspired by Jesus were to a greater extent than one would suppose wrung from antagonistic forces on the battlefield, because they could not be gotten any other way. Christian Holland, for example, would be little more than a

memory, but for its Christian manhood that fought for existence at the edge of the sword. The name of Napoleon Bonaparte with all the military genius that it signifies, has its largest significance in the Christian valor he engendered in the hearts of the myriads of those who opposed his selfish, imperialistic, materialistic ideals and who had to die in order to retain and further their God-given social rights. The French revolution—what was it but an awful crisis between the forces of right and wrong that had been brewing for two generations and which when it broke was but an incident in the onward march of Christian civilization! When we read in the great charter the sentence, "*No freeman shall be seized or imprisoned, or dispossessed or outlawed or in any way brought to ruin; we will not go against any man or send against him, save by legal judgment of his peers or by the law of the land*" and when we read in that same charter "*To no man will we sell or deny, or delay right or justice*"—when we read these things let us not forget that even so elemental rights as these as late as twelve hundred years after Jesus Christ were wrung from tyrants only after the army of the masses was drawn up in battle array on the banks of the Thames. When that document of human freedom was written it was written in blood, and it was a new page of gospel revelation. And surely the history of our own country from Plymouth Rock and Jamestown to the Spanish-American war, and the war just ended, is more than half a history of the gospel sword, drawn in dire necessity on behalf of Christian civilization. American independence from England, the eradication of slavery and popular government, would we have ever gotten them, would we be what we are today, if it had not been for the Yorktowns and Valley Forges and Gettysburgs and Antietams and Manila Bays and Chateau Thierry? These are all Christian battlefields. They shall stand eternal memorials that twenty and sixty and a hundred and fifty years ago the spirit of a selfish world stood up boldly against the spirit of Jesus Christ. Without the power of the gospel sword we should still be paying our money

into a foreign treasury, perhaps sending our young manhood to foreign battlefields; we would quite likely still have the canker worm of slavery eating at our national heart. Anywhere you look upon it the history of the firm establishment of Christian political and social institutions is to a large extent the history of the sword. These blessings have come to us in the shed blood of a hundred generations of Christian martyrs. It was the sword of Christ against the sword of greed and imposition—the sword of freedom against the sword of thralldom—the sword of humanity against the sword of inhumanity. But when will this conflict of swords cease, you ask? Will it cease when we get a league of peace? Will it cease when nations have disarmed? This is when it will cease. It will cease when all men and nations exemplify the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ; when the ideal of Jesus of a divine brotherhood has conquered; when men and nations recognize the principle of doing unto others as they would have others do unto them; when racial pride and heritage is submerged in a universal consciousness of the common origin of all men in a father God and a fine sense of moral obligation to him.

Last of all take for illustration individual Christian life. If the gospel of Jesus Christ hasn't meant something of a sword to you and me, it hasn't meant much. The Christian who hasn't had to struggle, who hasn't had to fight, who hasn't been positive and frank and courageous enough to invite the hack of the world's sword, and who hasn't with all his might hacked back, isn't possessed of much of the Christ spirit. Anyhow he is only a negative Christian at best. His religion is not a life. It is a pastime, a diversion and a luxury. When the disciples wanted to follow Christ he told them they would have to take up their crosses, and if they couldn't drink of the cup that he drank of they were none of his. No, brethren, if you want a strifeless religion, if you don't want any pain or any scars, don't follow Jesus. Christian character is a matter of fight down to the point where when it is

done, you can say, "*I have fought a good fight.*" Jesus offers you and me peace. "*My peace I give unto you.*" But it is not a ready-made peace. Between us and it there is something intermediary. We have got to win it. We have got to take up the sword first. We have got to battle for it against our worser selves, against principalities and powers, against the flesh and the devil. There are some religions that bear the name of Christian in which all we have got to do is just sit still and be peaceful, contemplate the beautiful and deny that there is any evil in the world. As surely as Christ was a suffering Christ and felt poignantly the sting of sin they are spurious. To be a real Christian means a sword. It means that when you come to lay this life down you will have to lay it down as one of that multitude of whom it is written: "*These are they that have come out of*"—not peace—not ease—not rest—"*These are they that have come out of great tribulation and washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.*"

LANCASTER, PA.



### III.

#### ON PARALLEL LINES.

GEORGE B. RUSSELL, A.M., D.D., LL.D., AND  
HERMAN JULIUS RUETENIK, D.D., LL.D.

J. H. STEPLER.

Rev. G. B. Russell was born in August, 1824, on the Antietam, in Maryland. Rev. H. J. Ruetenik was born also in rural surroundings, north of Berlin, in September, 1826.

The former died on a Sunday morning in January, 1908; the latter also on a Sunday morning in February, 1914.

These two distinguished men were not alike in their physical or mental make-up, but they were very much alike in their work and career as *editors, publishers, authors and educators*, during fifty years. Also in self denial and service to the Reformed Church.

Dr. Russell was a free, courageous, independent thinker and fighter; Dr. Ruetenik went his way quietly, doing his duty, as he saw it, in a peaceful, persevering spirit.

Of the two it is safe to say that Russell was the stronger, physically and mentally. If his life had been turned into a different channel, he might have attained eminence in the legal profession, as an astute lawyer, or judge; or in a business life, he might have accumulated wealth. Of Ruetenik we can say that he was the better educated, and more refined by nature and training. With resources scarcely inferior, he had more perseverance, and in reality achieved more lasting results. But these assertions are mere generalities. How far they may be correct, will perhaps appear by a closer examination of the facts before us.

In looking at Ruetenik's childhood, one can see at once

that he had exceptional advantages,—with a loving mother, a painstaking, conscientious father, a home of brothers and sisters, of books and music, and unusual educational facilities. How different in the case of the freckled red-headed Russell boy. His first four years were fairly favorable. His happiest times were probably when the parents, with four of their children, six persons on two horses, went to church on Sunday mornings. These years were spent on the paternal farm, which, all too soon, was sold by the sheriff. Then came poverty, and life in a public house, which was “not suitable for baptized children.” The family affairs went from bad to worse. When the father saw that he was unable to provide for his six children, he started to go west. He disappeared from view. George now had before him three years of a loveless life and pitiable hardships. When twelve years old, there came an improvement. But still he remains a friendless boy and has a hard struggle, with next to no schooling. Strangers make use of him in a store. Then he undertakes to learn cabinet making. He earns enough money to start for himself in a very modest way, repairing old furniture. When he has earned a little money he spends it in going to school. Then came “the mystic stirrings,” that urged him on, to strive for an education, amid extreme privations. He boarded himself with 69 cents a week. All the while asking no help from others, he begins and completes his college course. And he stood near the head of his class when he graduated.

How different the student years of Ruetenik!

But now the tables are turned. While Russell is on the up grade, in possession of his diploma from Marshall College; Ruetenik, a political refugee, enters a school of life, if possible more trying, than the worst of Russell's. When finally he too comes from under the yoke, both begin in *educational work*.

Russell readily obtains a position in the parochial high school of Middletown, Maryland. Ruetenik, a stranger in a strange land, is glad to get a country school. Later he begins

an academy of his own in Easton, Pa. Now Russell is soon tutor in college, while he studies theology in the seminary. After this he is sub-rector of the preparatory department of Franklin and Marshall College.

THEN BOTH BECOME PIONEER MISSIONARIES.

In 1853 Ruetenik had been sent to Toledo, Ohio; early in 1854 Russell was commissioned to Pittsburg, Pa. Ruetenik, in the much newer and smaller town, had the harder task before him. And Russell cherished no illusions as to the difficulties confronting him. While ordinarily he is not lacking in self confidence, he makes this confession:

"Trembling in distrust of self, on the train, only four days after ordination, the unknown journey was begun, not conferring with flesh and blood. The untried missionary had never been west of the mountains; had not a single acquaintance in the strange city; and there were no Reformed churches, no historic name for us there, and no consulting brethren within many miles. A stranger, much like our first missionary in Japan, with a heavy heart passed through the great tunnel of the Alleghenies, on the third day after it was opened for regular travel. Many times, while descending the western slope, still filled with misgivings, came the wish that the train were reversed, so that the untried journey might end where it had begun. But the die was cast."

No doubt, Ruetenik, having come the same way, a few months before, had had similar feelings. If the difficulties were in any degree greater, that must have been the case in Toledo, where Ruetenik could begin only with a few poor, and strange immigrants. And it may be admitted that Russell met with more success than did Ruetenik. And he remained longer in his fine, rich field. Many years later he expressed, to the present writer, regret that he had not remained and persevered in Pittsburg, like Ruetenik did later in Cleveland, for the rest of his days. Probably he had more real

satisfaction from the work in his first field of missionary labor, than in any subsequent enterprise. He found some influential and faithful friends, and he saw promising results. He was never a real ritualist; and in doctrine he was more intensely Protestant than many of his former fellow students; but he claims that his (Grace Reformed) church was the first in our denomination to introduce and use, with very slight modifications, the general service of the Provisional Liturgy.

He had not labored in vain. He could say later: "The charge was left in great prosperity, with a fine new church and lot, costing \$12,000, an active membership growing in wealth, and increased from the original seven members to 125, after accounting for deaths, removals, and other heavy city drains. The Sunday-school was better then than any time since. It had developed three candidates for the ministry and trained some most valuable members and officers. The harvest of the first sowing others have reaped. Perhaps no other mission before or since has been so short a time on the roll. None have made greater returns for general benevolence, by some thousands, than Grace church. The pastor's salary at first was \$500 a year, the Board only making up of that amount what the mission could not pay, besides rent and expenses. After the dedication, the salary was \$700 a year."

As late as November 13, 1907, he received from the Rev. Dr. J. H. Prugh, at the time pastor of Grace Church, a flattering tribute, as an echo of long ago. In this he was told: "That you were honored of God to be the first pastor of Grace Church, Pittsburgh, and of Grace Church, Washington, D. C., are doubtless among your sweetest memories. And it has been a constant inspiration to me, in my ministry, to strive to be a worthy successor of the noble men, who led this people in the long ago."

So Russell and Ruetenik had begun their ministry doing pioneer missionary work. Almost simultaneously they also began as

## PUBLISHERS AND EDITORS.

Ruetenik had started to issue the *Evangelist* in 1856. In January, 1859, Russell issued the *Pastors' Helper*, the first Sunday-school paper of the Reformed Church. He now also assumed control of the *Mercersburg Review*. And in 1861 the Ohio Synod elected him editor of the *Western Missionary*, now the *Christian World*. It was largely on that account that he resigned Grace Church; but before he took over the Ohio Synod's paper, he reconsidered and declined the call.

Russell continued to issue the *Pastors' Helper* for seven years, when the Publication Board of Philadelphia took it over, under a new name (*The Treasury*). In the years 1868 to 1871, he was doing editorial work on the *Messenger*. At the same time he was "book editor." Under his supervision quite a number of books were issued. Among others there was a series of Sunday-school books,—Dr. Harbaugh's *Future Life*, *Heavenly Recognition*, *The Life of Schlatter*, *The Golden Censer*, Harbaugh's *Harfe*, some works of Drs. Nevin, Bausman, Gerhart, Rauch, the Tercentenary Monument, Russell's *Creed and Customs*, etc.

While he was one of the editors of the *Messenger*, there were frequent frictions. They led eventually to his severing his connection with that office. But much later he is again "in-cog. editor" on the same paper, as also on the *Christian World*.

Leaving Philadelphia, Russell had returned to Pittsburgh, and in January, 1873, he issued, as editor and publisher, the *Reformed Era*, a weekly paper. It soon became a favorite with many readers; but friends of the *Messenger* managed to effect a combination, or merger, with the older paper, and Russell nursed his grievance for a long time.

Ruetenik's career as editor and publisher was less checkered. He had less trouble, early and late in life, when he was his own publisher. During more than twenty years, when he was editor of the weekly church paper, under a publication board, he too had antagonists, but even then he quietly held his ground, till he resigned of his own accord. As business man-

ager he too had his troubles, which eventually led to his retirement. This took place after the Central Publishing House was well established. But in this kind of church service Russell had no share or experience. In the biography of Dr. Ruetenik, the present writer has dwelled on this so fully, that there is no occasion to elaborate it here.

The educational work of both men has been mentioned in part already. But with maturer years they naturally accomplished more. So it is worth while to recur to those services. Especially in the case of Ruetenik. All the more, as, in the estimation of some friends, this man's best work was done in this line. And to a great extent he lived for and in this work. Certainly more than Dr. Russell. And he came to it honestly. We are not aware that the son of the poor Maryland farmer inherited much from his father, that fitted him for his life-work. It was different with Ruetenik. His father had a veritable passion and forte for teaching, so the son took to it naturally. What he did in this line, in the Orphan's Home, in Halle, while a university student, and later in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and at Heidelberg in Tiffin, may be regarded as preparatory. But his presidency and teaching in Calvin College, stands out unique. It is doubtful whether a school for higher education has ever been begun and maintained for a third of a century, under such adverse circumstances, while accomplishing so much. And Ruetenik was the prime mover, and only spontaneous factor in the history of the institution. He had a constant struggle to maintain it. No endowment, no monied friends, no influential patrons backed that school. Incessantly Ruetenik urged, exhorted, begged and battled in behalf of the same. The money needed for its maintenance came from a very limited number of comparatively poor people. The students he obtained largely from beyond the ocean.

And what sacrifices he made! It is said that he took of his wife's meagre dowry to buy the land needed to secure a home for the school.



When comparatively free from other duties he did much of the teaching himself. And he had a wonderful ability to stimulate the thinking faculty of his students. This perhaps will always stand out as his greatest achievement, because of the long list of prominent men who have come from this humble institution. This work strikingly resembled the now famous definition of what constitutes a real university: "Mark Hopkins at one end of a log and a student at the other." Was there ever so much accomplished with such limited means?

Dr. Russell too called himself an educator. His early services in that line have been mentioned above. Later in life he was identified with several projects, looking to the establishment of educational institutions. While still pastor of Grace Church, he, with several others, thought of reviving the Pittsburgh College idea. It was considered and talked about, but without result. Then a Mr. John Irwin made an attractive offer of a valuable piece of land, for such a purpose; but again nothing came of it.

Then he and the Rev. Dr. F. K. Levan actually bought a fine college for \$1,500, at Mount Pleasant, Pa. The teaching force was organized and the prospects seemed flattering. The presidency was offered to Russell, but he was still pastor of Grace Church. So he declined it. Dr. Levan was then elected. Students came in goodly number. But "there was too much spread of canvas for the ballast." The debts accumulated and the college was swamped. So this was a failure.

A few years later, when Russell was again in Pittsburgh, the much talked of Wilhelm Legacy was in sight for educational purposes. Everything seemed auspicious for the prospective college. But the wind turned and that scheme too fell through.

His ability being known and acknowledged, Dr. Russell had, while at his best, quite a number of flattering calls to prominent churches and even to reputable institutions of learning. In the summer of 1881 he received a call as presi-

dent of Palatinate College at Myerstown, Pa. The position was vacant and the call was urgent. He accepted. He had barely entered on the duties of the office, when he found everything in a deplorable condition. Confusion reigned in the whole spirit and make-up of the institution. "Gathering up the reins with as strong and determined a hand as possible, making a new departure, was an immediate necessity." At first it seemed as if he would succeed. But all too soon the old spirit of trouble and disorder broke out anew. The board of trustees failed to support the president in his efforts to improve matters. In less than two years he resigned. For him this was a very painful experience. And this really ended his educational work.

It is very evident that Russell, as an educator, was much more unfortunate than Ruetenik. As far as we are able to see, all that the latter lacked was adequate financial support. It is evident too, that Russell had done his best educational work in the earlier years of his life. In the case of Ruetenik the opposite seems true.

#### THE TWO MEN AS AUTHORS.

Here we find Russell and Ruetenik more nearly on even or equal ground. Each had unusual mental resources. Each was master of his language. Each had a fine literary style. That of Ruetenik was pure, smooth, lucid, plain and pleasing. That of Russell was direct, forceful and popular. Both were impelled to say what they thought and felt. Both aimed to render their readers a real service. Their editorial writings had enhanced their ability to write well. What more can you expect of an author? Some of their writings have a permanent value. Most of them served their time.

Ruetenik began earlier, wrote more, and his writings cover a wider range. He began writing beautiful stories. They were well adapted to their time and they found favor. Printed at first as serials, in his weekly church paper, the readers were impatient to read the continuation in the next

number. When in like manner he published his *Church History*, his readers looked forward to its completion, in two volumes. Having peculiarities and advantages of its own, the work is still used as a text-book in some schools. His largest volume, *Beruehmte Deutsche in Amerika*, aims to reach a class of readers rarely reached by a minister. But his view point and treatment accord fully with his principles.

His *Pioneers of the Reformed Church* was published simultaneously in both languages. Written in his simple, straightforward style, this work is of exceptional value. In his characteristic grouping, he gives us true life-pictures of the men who gathered and organized the early immigrants from the Fatherland. His other and minor books were largely for use in schools. Being mostly in the German language, the titles are here omitted. The same statement applies to a number of periodicals, which he issued, as his own publisher, from time to time.

Dr. Russell has not written so many books; but what he wrote was always well worth reading. And they are certainly worth mentioning here. The first one was *The Ripe Harvest*. It urged attention to a crying need of the time. It is a pity that it is out of print now.

Perhaps his most important work is *Creed and Customs of the Reformed Church*. This is very highly spoken of by Dr. Nevin, Rufus W. Miller and many others. It has passed through several editions and is too well known to need much of recommendation here. *Jesus in the Home* is likewise very valuable. A good authority says of it: "This is a practical book, written by a practical man, for practical people, for the fathers, mothers and young people of the Reformed Church, and for all other Christian people, old and young." The Rev. Dr. A. S. Weber too has much to say in favor of this "interesting, helpful and stimulating little book."

Dr. Russell was very intimately acquainted with that worthy father, N. P. Hacke, who for fifty-eight years was pastor of the old Greensburg charge. That life was worth a biography. Russell wrote it.

When past eighty years old he wrote his

FOUR SCORE AND MORE.

*Memorabilia quorum magna pars fui.*

This book was prepared by request of his family. It was not intended for general circulation. The author has much to tell of wrongs he endured, early and late in life. Was he always blameless?

AGAIN IN MISSIONARY WORK.

The two men, as we have seen, began their public life as pioneer missionaries.

As for Ruetenik, he was called away from Toledo, to a professorship in Tiffin. True, even here he undertook to do some church work that really was of the missionary character; but that had to be discontinued.

Subsequently, in Cleveland, he built up the first Reformed Church, which again was in reality missionary labor; but did not go under that designation. But at the age of sixty, while at the head of Calvin College, he began the Eighth Reformed Church, which was a mission indeed, though it neither received nor asked any support, from any board. This became in reality a Ruetenik church. It is at present probably our most prosperous church in Cleveland.

It must stand to the credit of Russell that he was ever ready to break new ground, as a home missionary. He did this in quite a number of places. In January, 1863, he undertook to establish a mission in Allegheny city. The pastor and members of Grace Church, in Pittsburgh, across the river, were bitterly opposed to this. But St. Paul's Classis, that had jurisdiction over the Allegheny field, favored it. Russell, now a member of this classis, proceeded to do what he felt was right. In the first year of his services there he received only \$70; in the second, \$300; in the third, \$500; in the next year \$800. So there seemed to be a steady growth. Then the missionary was called east. In the hands of successors this mission died (or was killed).

Russell, now in Philadelphia, in 1869, began his third mission. This time in Delaware. Again without salary, he made a promising start. And again the successors are blamed for the ultimate failure. Then our man undertook his fourth mission. This was St. John's in West Philadelphia. Here again we have a stormy story. In a way, the victory was won in the end, after a long legal fight. His fifth venture, also promising at first, in the East End of Pittsburgh, also was a failure in the end.

In 1877 the Tri-Synodic Board decided to establish a mission in Washington, D. C. It was proposed to vote \$1,500 as a proper appropriation, for the missionary. This being an unheard of sum, Dr. Russell objected. In his estimation \$1,200 was sufficient, under the circumstances. Thereupon he was elected to serve as missionary there. He accepted reluctantly. It involved quite a sacrifice on his part. He soon found exceptional difficulties in this field. The few people who could be induced to identify themselves with the mission, were not homogeneous. Some were extremely high church, others were in the opposite extreme. For some the pastor used too much liturgy; for others not nearly enough. It was impossible to please all. With all his tact and prudence, he failed to unite the conflicting elements. Complaints reached the Board. There was an "investigation," which resulted in the pastor's resignation. All this occurred while the Board was owing him \$1,100.

During this period the doctor made the acquaintance of many high officials, but only a friendly German *Amtsbruder* afforded him some relief, when his own pockets were empty.

Dr. Russell felt again that he had been badly treated. As we do not know all the facts, it is not for us to judge.

In placing the activities of our two men side by side, it is meet to call to mind how each bore his troubles. Positive characters will of necessity make enemies. Ruetenik and Russell too had their antagonists, in the different periods of their lives. Here is one case in point. As stated before,

Ruetenik had in 1856 begun to publish, of his own accord, the *Evangelist*. It was started as a free lance, in the interest of vital religion in the Reformed Church. In some editorial he had displeased some persons of influence. This was resented in the next meeting of Synod. The result was that, by a resolution, he was deposed as editor of his own paper. Another man was elected in his place. Ruetenik, then a young man, simply refused to surrender his rights. He made no fight, but he retained control of his paper.

Dr. Russell, about 1873, had a similar experience. Apparently with the good will of the Pittsburgh Synod, or, as he understood it, with a moral contract, he had begun to publish the *Reformed Era*. In less than three years the paper was taken out of his hands and merged with the *Messenger*. Russell protested. What more could he do? His readers were nearly all in the Pittsburgh Synod. Without the good will of that body, his paper could scarcely have any future. To establish the paper he had sunk money and assumed all risk. Then others were reaping where he had been sowing. That is as he looked at it. But he submitted.

However, he did not always submit. He had much more experience in church judicatories than Ruetenik. And he was somewhat pugnacious. He was frequently in demand as counsel. Especially in appeal cases. Probably he had more ability than love for that kind of work. He had come to this conclusion: "Generally appeals come before church courts with dirty faces—always unwelcome, often exceedingly unpleasant, or positively disagreeable. Not one in many but should have been settled before being brought to such a hearing. They are time consumers, patience killers, and seldom in fact receive a full or impartial examination."

However, he too came to the General Synod with a case of his own. He felt that he had been wronged, and that justice required his vindication. There is no need for a full rehearsal of the matter here. Certain charges had been



brought against him, and Classis had been called on to investigate. The investigation had taken place. The charges had not been proven. This result did not please the prosecution. They had the matter aired before the Potomac Synod. This body asked Mercersburg Classis to reinvestigate the charges. Against this action Russell appealed to the General Synod of Lebanon, Pa. (1890). In the minutes of this synod we see that Russell was sustained by 84 votes against 15 (7 non liquet). One can not imagine a like trouble in connection with Dr. Ruetenik.

Russell had won out, but his reputation had suffered. Earlier in life he had been much in demand, for all kinds of positions in the church. He was still a strong man every way, but calls did not reach him now as they did formerly. He lived on his farm, served the Church as he had occasion, and took care of his financial matters.

When Ruetenik and Russell were well advanced in years, the differences between them became greater. While Ruetenik kept up the habits of former years, in altruistic and diligent labor, in the deaconess cause and in his Italian mission, making even his last years fruitful and precious, Russell, now a farmer, in practical retirement, lived, it seems, a somewhat cheerless life. Ruetenik was busily at work among the indifferent masses of the big city, Russell was apparently a friendless old man, as he had been a friendless boy. What he tells of the incendiary fires and the coldness towards him on the part of the neighbors, must have been all but pleasant. No doubt he still had friends among his fellow ministers, who knew his better self, but to have the ill will of some, and the indifference of others in the neighborhood, is not an agreeable experience. No one likes to be unloved. Kind neighbors and faithful friends are, according to Luther's catechism, included in the prayer for our daily bread. Especially so, when the frailties of old age make us dependent, more than ever, on those around us. Even a brilliant mind and an enviable past can not make up for helpful and loving friends. This must

have been a sorrow to Russell. But, after all, it will not change the opinion of men who knew his better self.

His income from the Church had always been very meagre indeed, but he was shrewd in business. His investments seem to have been fortunate. Formerly often quite poor, he came eventually to own considerable real estate. It came to him not by inheritance, "but all by rigid economy, care and divine favor. His salary had been on the average \$300 to \$500 a year. He had suffered from incendiary fires, and he had to pay as bondsman, at one time, over \$4,000 and at another time about \$6,000. It seems this good nature was all that he inherited from his father. But with all this, he was late in life encumbered with upwards of 1,700 acres of land. So he was enabled to donate 880 acres "of rich mineral land to Catawba College in North Carolina." So we need not wonder that he had a fine homestead late in life, and a rather imposing mausoleum after death, near Waynesboro, Pa. In all this he was very unlike Dr. Ruetenik.

Both were happily married. But while the Rueteniks had a fine large family, the Russells had only a lovely daughter as a comfort in their advanced years. The prolonged married life of both men must have been a great solace in the evening of their lives.

Here it may be recalled that each of these two men took a warm interest in the benevolent work of the Church. In accordance with this, Dr. Russell, after consultation with the German pastor at Butler, Pa., actually bought, on his own responsibility, the fine mansion of the late General McCall at Butler, to be used as an orphans' home. In due time this was then ratified and assumed by St. Paul's Classis. The writer of this is probably the only man now living who had a hand in this; but only to vote for the deal when so far completed.

Dr. Ruetenik, very late in life, undertook another benevolent work, by establishing the Kauffholz Deaconess Home. He was over eighty when he engaged in this. But his day was drawing to a close. He died before he reached the success hoped for.

Dr. Rufus W. Miller says of Russell that he was a great man. Others have said the same of Ruetenik. But the final judgment is not left to erring man. Comparisons are odious. Our intention, in placing these two men side by side, is merely to recall their services, and to give credit where credit is due. This has been done to some extent by others heretofore, but in places scarcely within reach. Dr. Russell's latest book, his autobiography, was—to use his own expression—printed, but not published. He wrote it by request of his family, for a limited circle of readers. So it was not thrown on the book market. Introductory to the book, Dr. Rufus W. Miller, who knew him well, has been generous in giving him credit. He emphasized the fact that Dr. Russell was a man with a creed, a man with a conscience and a man of courage. Similarly Dr. Nevin had characterized Russell's graduation oration as bold, free, correct, and independent thinking.

Dr. A. C. Whitmer, speaking of Russell, says: "Growing up in poverty, of which he was never ashamed, he rose from obscurity to prominence in the Church, by virtue of real merit; for he was a man of unusual mental strength, of great force of character, of scholarly tastes, and sincerely devoted to his work. And it may be truly said, that in reference to the general work of the Church, he often saw farther and deeper than most men of his day."

The Rev. E. O. Keen, in his funeral address, testified of Russell as follows: "As a child, a youth and a man, as a son, a brother, a husband and a father, as a minister of the gospel, an author, publisher, an editor, a contributor to religious periodicals, a teacher, a college professor and president, a delegate to the various judicatories of the Church, on the floor of Classis, of Synod and General Synod, the representative of his Church at different ecclesiastical assemblies, denominational and inter-denominational, preacher and missionary pastor, he was faithful in the service of his king, using the great powers of body, mind and soul, of which God had made him steward." This is saying enough for Dr. Russell.

In the biography of Dr. Ruetenik, to be soon out, the reader will find tributes of twenty competent witnesses, who are unstinted in their words of commendation concerning the Cleveland man.

But the final judgment of these men, or any others, is not left in the hands of poor human beings. God alone knows all. And He alone is just, infallibly just. To him too must be left what Dr. Russell wrote of complaints and criticisms in this latest book of his. It is true, he is still the same man that he was. Here too he is extremely candid. He seems to hide nothing. He shows himself to be the fighter that he was in former years. We may believe that it was from a sense of justice and truth that he is often so outspoken and uncharitable against others.

With all that, it is also noticeable, that, as he came nearer to the end of the book and of life, there is a softer tone, mellowed by the nearer prospect of eternity and the final reckoning. In his "swan song" this is noticeable. These are beautiful thoughts of his in this connection: "As it is not a sad thing for the sun, at its appointed hour, to set, because it shall rise again, so in a similar sense, it is not an untimely ending for a full aged Christian to die. . . . At any time now for me, may come the happy release. . . . And now in this frame of mind, with firm faith, there need be no occasion for alarm, or uneasiness, because the messenger shall sooner or later—and soon at the latest—be sent with the call at the end of my life's day. . . . If the end of the day comes when the work is done, the ready servant enters gladly into rest. . . . Though there be many shortcomings and occasions of conscious failure, which, with my past experience and present concepts, could have been very much improved, or turned to better account. . . . Imperfection, mistakes, and failures are deeply deplored; and wrong-doings, falls and sins are deeply repented of. . . . Doubtless there was good reason for the providential checking, so often applied to me. . . . No one in fact, let it be learned, is an absolute necessity for the success of God's work. One

man being laid off does not stop the harvest. The backset of some years, relegating a worker like Paul or Luther . . . was perhaps needed to mellow undue aspirations." Here we may leave Dr. Russell.

As for Ruetenik, he had no time, took no time, to write a book about his own life. Near ninety, his work was still for others. Like Russell, he too went home on a Sunday morning.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

ADDENDA.

1. Russell and Ruetenik had but a slight acquaintance with each other. Though much of the time in similar work, they were in different spheres: Russell in the east, and in the English part of the Church; Ruetenik in the west and in the German wing. The influence of each, especially as editorial writers, in which each was uncommonly successful, is beyond the power of computation.

2. The great and varied services of Ruetenik should be better known and appreciated. No one may claim adequate knowledge of our history in the last century who has not taken notice of this remarkable factor. As his telling work was done in the German part of the Church, too little has been known of him.

There is now, or soon will be, available a biography of the man, in English, which will enable those interested, to make a closer acquaintance with him.

#### IV.

### PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.<sup>1</sup>

DAVID B. LADY.

#### 1. DEFINITION.

(a) *Theology*.—Theology reduced to its simplest terms is the knoweldge of God. As usually understood it is the knowl-edge of God, logically, systematically, scientifically and com-prehensively apprehended and set forth. But there are degrees in our knowledge of what we profess to know. We often know very imperfectly, then again we know more fully, and perhaps at times we know adequately. We grasp what we know more or less scientifically and according to intellectual laws, depending on our mental training and the amount of labor bestowed upon the subject; and we state what we know crudely, in a fragmentary or one-sided way, or clearly, logically and completely. And we do this with the knowledge of God. The degree of accuracy of our knowledge of God, and the fulness of it, depend largely on the character of our own minds, our training, our ability to know anything thor-oughly, and the amount of time we have given to the subject. It remains true that theology, reduced to its simplest terms, is the knowledge of God.

Your idea of God, your conception of God, your under-standing of God, is your theology. Your theology is correct and adequate in the degree in which your idea-or conception or understanding of God approaches what God himself is. The truth here as elsewhere is a statement of the facts in the case.

<sup>1</sup> The lecture on the "Reverend Charles F. McCauley Memorial" founda-tion delivered in the winter of 1918 before the faculty and students of the Theological Seminary at Lancaster, Pa., by the Rev. David B. Lady, D.D.



The knowledge of God, as is true of a great deal of other knowledge, through the application of one great mind after another to its study and explanation, as the centuries came and passed, has been developed into a science, which, with its several branches, is taught and studied in our theological seminaries.

There are reasons to believe that it is the nature and will of God to make himself known. We have nothing to do here with the origin of man or the origin of his environment. We can only go back to the beginnings of human history. In all the centuries since impressions and facts began to be recorded God has been regarded as revealing himself. Two thousand years ago a Christian writer said: The invisible things of him, his eternal power and godhead, are plainly seen from the things which he made. Hundreds of years before that a writer of hymns said: The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament sheweth his handiwork. The evidences of God's existence and wisdom and providence are abundant in history. He spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets of Israel and her law-givers and by the prophets and law-givers of the nations which we are accustomed to call the heathen. He hath in these last days spoken with us by his Son, and by believers on and followers of the Son, in the history and literature of the Church, and no less in the great divinely inspired missionary and reformatory movements of modern times.

## 2. PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

(a) *The Influence of Divine Truth on Character and Life.*  
—The human being is dependent to a very large extent upon food and the atmosphere and climate and light. What we eat and the air we breathe are taken into the system and become part of us. They sustain and support and invigorate and give character to our bodies. A man physically is to a great degree what he eats and drinks and breathes. This explains and accounts for many of the characteristics of the different inhabitants of the various parts of the earth.

There is food also for the mind. It is knowledge—something to be known. It corresponds to the human intellect. It is truth. And it is imperishable. Truth crushed to earth will rise again. It does not change. Two and two always have and always will make four. The straight line always has been and always will be the shortest distance between two points. And the three angles of a triangle always have been and always will be equal to two right angles. Man eats and perishes. The food he eats is perishable food. He eats to live. But there comes a time when food will no longer keep him alive. He perishes in the midst of the greatest plenty. But truth is different.

Knowledge results in convictions. We believe what we know. And our convictions and our beliefs are a large part of our mental make up. They enter into and mould and determine our characters. All truth has this effect. The truths of mathematics are theoretical, but they are also in the profoundest sense concrete. They are realities and they give tone and vigor and enlargement to the mind. A man who has studied and taken into his mind a full course of mathematics is a very different man from one who has not done so. He knows something with certainty. He is sure of something. *He has some convictions. He has something to stand upon. His mind has foundations. It has some strength and equipment.* It is not a blank. And he is not an intellectual weakling. *His mind has undergone expansion. And it has contents. And the more one learns the more his mind is enlarged and the greater the sum and value of its contents.* Knowledge is experimental. It is intellectual experience. It enters into life. It effects changes. It expands and enlarges and enriches the mind. A study of biography and history brings men into sympathy with human life. The study of mathematics and the languages has a humanizing effect. It makes the mind stronger, more skillful. It makes a man more of a man than he was before and causes him to possess more of human life, brings him into deeper sympathy with his fellow-

men and the race. Hence these studies are named the humanities.

All the studies of what is commonly called a liberal education have an effect, each in its own line and degree. Languages, literature, art, history, geography, astronomy, medicine, jurisprudence, ethics, philosophy. None are to be despised or set aside. They bring to us as studies and sciences what is best among the things which the race has produced. And they put us in possession of what the race has produced. It belongs to and is part of our human being. "What a piece of work is man," the man with a mind filled with knowledge! "How noble in reason, how infinite in faculties, in form and moving how express and admirable, in action how like an angel, in apprehension how like a god."

The literature of the Greeks and Romans is a form of beauty. In this there is culture and a valuable and stimulating possession. But this literature is concerned with what was best and highest among the people who produced it. Greek and Roman writers recorded, embodied in their imperishable works, what was most worth while in their day in human life and achievement, in family life, in friendship, in patriotism, in loyalty to high principles and in religion. And the flavor of those admirable things enters the spirit of the student and develops sentiments similar to those set forth on the pictured pages of the classics. And they are more than pictures, painted ships on a painted ocean. They are realities. They were in their day. They are so still. They entered into the history of the race. They entered into the life and character of the race. They enter into the life and character of each generation, and much more into the life and character of the student blessed with the immense privilege of absorbing them in the process of receiving a liberal education.

And what is true of the knowledge which has been brought to a high degree of perfection in the course of time in secular history and race and national growth and culture is especially true of the knowledge of God. God is the greatest being of

whom we have any knowledge. The things of God are the greatest things with which man can come in contact and feed upon the absorb and assimilate and make his own.

All knowledge, rightly made of account by us, is experimental. It is not a theory but a condition. A million dollars is to most of us an intellectual proposition. But the dollars in our purses, which we use for bread and bed, to pay our contributions for the cause of Christ, and our taxes for the common good, are a possession, the value of which is realized in the blessings coming to us and others by means of them. All truth is a possession. We own it and it owns us. The man who has studied logic must think logically. We possess our mathematics and our history and the beauty and truth which we have learned. They have entered our lives and become part of us. Our lives have been moulded, re-moulded, re-generated by them. Money, though a mere material and external possession, has that effect. The sense of possession is something. Much more, the things which money can secure for us, a home, the support of wife and children in comfort—"To make a happy fireside clime for weans and wife"—books, travel, lectures, intercourse with the wise and good of our time, are a possession.

This is true especially of the knowledge of God. It is experimental and not theoretical. It becomes a possession. It enters the soul. We give up ourselves to it. Ideas rule the world. We surrender ourselves to their control. Ambition, Avarice, Love, Patriotism—they are great forces in the individual. In politics we speak of the adhesive power of public plunder. The knowledge of God is the present power of God in us. We apprehend and appropriate God when we know him. He is to us a possession, a present, powerful, transforming force in our lives. The man full of the knowledge of God is a God-possessed man, a God-inspired man. Enoch walked with God. Every man who knows God walks with God. God dwells with him. He is "closer than breathing, nearer than hands and feet," nearer than mind or purpose. He

is our portion and inheritance, our habitation. The sacred lyrics of Israel are full of this truth. Our best hymn writers have embodied it time and again in lines that will never be forgotten.

"Jesus I live to Thee,  
The loveliest and best,  
Thy life in me, my life in Thee  
In Thy blest love I rest."

A great effect is produced by the attainment of knowledge. It enlarges, expands, cultivates, builds up, elevates, ennobles, strengthens, develops human life. The most insignificant things to be known do this in their measure and degree. The higher the knowledge the greater the effect for enlargement and ennoblement. The end of knowledge is morality. The tendency is in this direction from the beginning. It is completed when the knowledge of God and the experience of religion come to the individual.

To be a complete man one must know, have an experience of, the things belonging to the realm in the midst of which his life is passed, to which he himself belongs, the facts and realities by which he is surrounded. The world about us, other human beings, relatives, society, industries, the great things going on about us, upheavals, world conflicts, affect us. We loose infinitely by trying to ignore them, to exist as though they did not exist. If one wishes to be dead in the midst of life he needs only shun all intercourse with others and never look at a paper or book. He will certainly shrivel into nothingness. The smallest imaginable lot in the cemetery will hold all that remains when his life becomes extinct. God is the greatest fact in our universe. His absence from our thinking, the absence of his influence from our living is an infinite loss to us. His presence in our thinking, in our emotions and in our willing is an invaluable gain to us. A man can only be a man when the universe of knowledge enters into his experience. He can only be a fully awake and an alive man when the knowledge of God informs and fills his life. The God-possessed man is the only fully developed man in history.

The knowledge of God, more than any other knowledge, brings about that immense change, scripturally described as a new birth. Ye must be born again. If any man be in Christ he is a new creature. Every child of God knows this by experience, whether the experience comes like a still small voice and slowly takes possession of the soul or whether it comes suddenly with the force of a rushing mighty wind, and whether it is known by one name or by another. This influences the man's thinking. It fixes his attitude towards the world and toward God, towards good and evil. That which among men God values, the man who knows God also values. It is propriety, lawfulness, good conduct, a walk and conversation like that of Jesus of Nazareth, or such as that of Jesus would have been under twentieth century conditions and in the million different circumstances in which a million different human beings find themselves in this age.

The knowledge of God is therefore immensely practical. That is its nature, and it is spoken of at length here in this way because it affects so largely the life and practices of those who possess it. An erroneous conception of God produces erroneous practices. Only a correct knowledge of God, a knowledge free from grossly erroneous views, produces practices, a life, conduct, approaching the highest human ideal, as found in Jesus, the Son of God. The knowledge of God, all knowledge of God, is practical. All theology is practical theology. The first, greatest, result of the knowledge of God is that we walk in his ways.

Practical theology is therefore first of all the practice of the knowledge of God, a manner of life based on and growing out of the knowledge, in other words, the presence and possession of God. It is an attitude towards God described as faith, a line of activities described as obedience and service, inspired, directed and controlled by the will of God.

The knowledge of God powerfully affects the individual who acquires that knowledge. In relation to wrong-doing it brings about repentance and reformation and results in the doing of the will of God.



Men do not need to wait until they come under the instruction of a Theological Seminary faculty to secure the knowledge of God necessary to influence them to repentance, faith and obedience, to bring them salvation. This is learned in childhood from Christian parents, in the Sunday School, in the Catechetical Class and from the lips of the pastor in the home and from the pulpit. To the extent in which the most unlearned man knows God, accepts the message of the gospel as true and walks by it he is a theologian and is practicing and living his theology.

But the knowledge of God, theology, studied and mastered under the tutelage of learned professors in a Theological Seminary, results in strengthening the convictions which a less scientific knowledge of God has created in the individual, and in bringing his life into fuller accord with the divine will. This should never be overlooked or forgotten. If anywhere in the world, or in the Church, we have a right to look for the fruits of the gospel in holy living it certainly is among the students of a Theological Seminary. If not, their theology would have to be set down as anything but practical.

(b) *The Practice of the Truth or Knowledge of God with Reference to Others.*—The study of theology is however also to lead to a special line of activities which we speak of as those of the Christian Ministry. And these activities are those we usually have in mind when we are thinking or speaking of practical theology.

The student of theology studies theology as a preparation for the ministry. The purpose of the years spent in the seminary and the labor bestowed upon his studies there, is, that he may preach the gospel of Jesus, the Son of God, and administer the office of a Christian pastor, with the greatest possible efficiency.

The medical student studies medicine that he may practice medicine, that he may follow the calling of a physician. We would consider him a very unwise man if he did not use his knowledge for his own health. But we mostly think of his

studies as a preparation for the practice of medicine for the benefit of others. The law student studies law that he may practice law, that he may follow the calling of an attorney-at-law. We would consider him a very unwise man if he did not use his knowledge of the law to prevent himself from falling into crime or making business mistakes. Ye will say unto me, physician heal thyself. But the lawyer studies law that he may practice it especially for the benefit of others.

The relation of the seminary student to the Christian ministry is just that of the medical student to the work of the physician and of the law student to the work of the attorney-at-law.

All the things the student does in his preparation for the discharge of the duties of the calling to which he is looking forward have practical value, and may be said to belong to practical theology or to be of that nature.

### 3. THE QUALIFICATIONS FOR SUCCESS.

Hugo Masters in the *Physical Magazine* for November, 1917, has these pertinent remarks: "Success does not happen, It is a result. Success is the result, usually, not of one or two things, but of a large number of factors, a combination of forces and qualities that work together. To find out whether one has these qualities requires a twofold analysis—an analysis of success and an analysis of oneself.

"Success is made up of a number of factors. You may have some of the necessary qualities, but may lack others. You may be clever, you may have exceptional ability, and therefore you naturally feel that you ought to be successful. And yet the lack of some other quality or qualities may doom you to failure, unless you can recognize the lack and supply it.

"The interesting and helpful thing about it all is that almost without exception these success qualities can be acquired. It is by finding out, through analysis, what you lack and by then cultivating and acquiring the deficient qualities that you can so strengthen the structure upon which you build

your business or professional career that you can make sure of success.

"To place the problem before you in as simple and helpful a light as possible," Mr. Masters goes on to say. "I have formulated a little chart covering the essential qualities which are involved in the building of success in the average case.

"1. Energy: (a) Bodily vigor; (b) Virility; (c) Nerve-force.

"2. Ability: (a) Brains; (b) Natural, Inherited Talents; (c) Training and Education.

"3. Character: (a) Will Power; (b) Persistence; (c) Integrity; (d) Industry; (e) Punctuality; (f) Self-confidence; (g) Ambition; (h) Enthusiasm.

"4. Personality: (a) Good Presence; (b) Address; (c) Appearance; (d) Voice and Speech; (e) Dignity; (f) Cheerfulness; (g) Magnetism.

"5. Generalship: (a) Management; (b) Judgment; (c) Business Insight."

"You may be able," he continues, "to improve upon this analysis or elaborate it. It is to be interpreted in the light of your own qualifications; and by an honest and persistent study of this chart you should be able to accomplish such an analysis of your own physical, mental and moral make up as will help you to know just where you stand."

All preparation for the exercise of the active duties and privileges of the ministry may be spoken of as, in an important sense, practical. An Academy and College training and a full Theological Seminary course are most important, as well as those branches of the course which have a direct bearing upon the development of the Christian virtues. Just as the study of mathematics and the dead languages, entering so largely into a liberal education, are to be preferred to a technical training for a particular profession, for mental discipline and development, so in theological studies it is not always those departments in the scheme of studies which are more immediately practical that are conducive to the highest

success in the work of the ministry. Whatever ministers to the making of a man, a complete man including the greatest cultivation of the intellect, the affections and the will, a spiritual man, an inspired man, a God-possessed man, is also practical. Such a man is more, in himself considered, and of more value to God and his fellowman, worthier, that is, worth more, than one who is not so educated and possessed. One may be without faults and be next to worthless. One may have faults and along with them great virtues and be very valuable to the world and the Creator of the world, in spite of his faults. As a final result, to be practical, to be in a position to be of the greatest service to oneself, to others and to God, in the highest degree one needs to be fully developed.

For greatness and great service, quality is essential. Some one once said, and it has been often repeated: "Some men are born great, others achieve greatness, and still others have greatness thrust upon them." This may be true in the sense of him who first said it, but it is not really true—not all of it. It is hardly correct to say that one is born great. He may be born with great original endowments, great capacities for improvement, but the improvement must be made before he is in a position to accomplish anything worth while. Greatness cannot be thrust upon a man. Greatness must be achieved. Often an unpromising and backward boy becomes great, accomplishes something worth while, in manhood. He acquires the habit of work and uses it. He comes in contact with great truths and makes them his own, and thinks out others. He grasps his opportunities. He is a growing man. Employing his powers, they become strong. He increases his capacity for work. In time when he applies himself to a task he is able to bring immense powers to bear upon the performance of it. What he accomplishes is not an insignificant result. The outcome corresponds to the man.

A thorough liberal education, years spent in grinding out Academy, College and Theological Seminary tasks, even the

study of the Semitic languages, and the critical examination of the text of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, have a great bearing upon a successful career in the ministry. A man so trained will bring gold and diamonds to his work and it will be highly refined gold and cut and polished diamonds. How can one understand great problems unless he has a great and thoroughly trained mind? How can one work hard and successfully at a given task unless he has capacity, application, industry and perseverance. Training produces ability, and ability for our work is an essential requisite.

Must the entire prescribed course be gone through? Why not? For this purpose was it prescribed. It was not worked out by men who did not understand their task. Must all the burdens of a nine years' course of instruction be borne. They are not burdens. The true student rejoices in them as a strong man to run a race. Do we say the task becomes easy? The vigorous mind desires no easy tasks, but such as suit its increasing capacity. We are only happy when working at full strength even when pursuing our studies. Much more is this true when we are engaged in the active work of our calling.

The minister of the gospel is an exponent and an advocate of the knowledge of God. He is himself an example of what the knowledge of God is able to produce. The essence of what the knowledge of God, which involves, as has been seen, the indwellingness of God, the presence of God in the life of the believer, effects, is piety, morality, virtue, a course of conduct not open to adverse criticism by friend or enemy. It comes to that in the end.

W. H. P. Faunce, president of Brown University, in his book, *The Educational Ideal in the Christian Ministry*, says on page 115: "The sole aim of Christianity is to make good men. But that aim is so simple and obvious that the world has found it quite incredible. The world has constantly assumed or inferred that something more abstruse or recondite or etherial must be the Christian goal—the defence of some

intellectual citadel, or the exposition of some philosophy, or the repetition of some mystic or life-giving rite. Therefore we cannot too often repeat that all rite and ceremony, all creed and philosophy, all architecture and liturgy, are but transient means to a permanent end—the making of good men. The aim of Christianity is ethical and it has no other aim whatever. Good men constituting a good society, living in league with all goodness human and divine—this is the Kingdom of Heaven mentioned oftener in the four gospels than any other subject, and forming the central idea in the teaching of Jesus.”

To labor to make men good and to build up a society of good men, followers, imitators of Jesus of Nazareth, partaking of the mind and spirit of the Master, the minister needs these qualifications—a heart transformed into the divine image by the knowledge of God and the experience of his mercy and grace, native force of character, developed and brought to high power by a liberal education, and technical knowledge of his subject and work in detail such as the lawyer, physician, teacher, journalist, diplomat, and statesman, have of their special work, and, having these, the minister is ready to enter upon the active duties of his calling.

What his work is in outline is seen at a glance in this quotation from the pen of Theodore Gerald Soares, of the University of Chicago, in his definition of practical theology.

“Practical Theology,” says Professor Soares, “is the science which studies the activities that result from the institutionalizing of religion, specifically of Christianity. Christianity is not an institution but a way of life, a faith. The faith becomes institutional in the activity of preaching, whence the science of homiletics; in the organized ministry to personal religious needs, whence the science of pastoral care; in an organized community, the Church, with a definite constitution, whence the science of ecclesiastical polity; in the organized Church with an elaborate system of practical activities, whence the science of Church administration; in a technique of worship for the development of religious feeling,



whence the science of liturgies; in a system of educational development, whence the science of religious education; and in all these interests extended beyond the borders of the immediate Christian community, whence the science of missions."

It would be impossible in the brief time allotted, and proper to be used here, to expand and elaborate or dwell at any length on this or any similar outline of practical theology, or even to do so briefly, to advantage. All this will easily be found in books on the subject and is no doubt given in the lectures of the incumbent of the chair of this branch of theology. It is preferred here to urge at further length, even at the risk of repetition, the importance of what has already been insisted upon, the practical character of the students preparation for his future work in the way of making himself all he is capable of becoming in the way of a strong, well trained, well educated, fully developed, Christian man, a man of broad mind, of a sympathetic heart, fully in touch with the great truths with which he has to do, and prepared to make them and himself as an example of their effect upon character and life, felt in the communities in which it may be his lot to exercise his ministry, and to follow this with some other considerations conceived to have a bearing upon the case.

Perhaps it might be well to quote a page from *The Building of the Church*, by Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, pp. 211, 212:

"The preacher needs a vision to keep the gospel vital on his lips. Only men of capacious heart can preach with power the message which thrilled prophets and apostles. It is a scandal in the Christian church when the minister is a petty man. A thin and stunted personality cannot be a fit channel for the heavenly grace. Conceited pedants, opinionated snobs and supercilious dandies may stand in a Christian pulpit, but they cannot preach the gospel. The gospel is the message of the broad-minded, sweet-hearted, lofty-spirited, brotherly son of God. To make himself large enough to transmit even a little of the Master's spirit is a true preacher's life-long ambi-

tion and unending struggle. The great sentences of the New Testament shrivel on the lips of narrow-headed zealots who excommunicate their brethren who differ from them. In the eyes of God he is both a heretic and a scismatic who by word or action breaks the law of love. The preacher who wishes to preach with the apostolic accent must breathe the atmosphere in which the apostles did their work. He must come under the power of Him who is the express image of the infinitely sympathetic and all-embracing God. Devotion to the Church ought to add cubits to a man's spiritual stature and new diameters to the circle of his sympathies. If the word ecclesiastic has taken on a dark and sinister meaning, it is only an added proof of the wizardry of the mystery of evil which is able to corrupt human hearts even when engaged with things holiest and highest."

Speaking of education, it is sometimes said that the highly educated man's preaching is in danger of being over the heads of his audience. This will not be the case if his education is a real education, if it has given him the ability to understand human life and the profound things of life, matters of conscience and will and character. Paul, the most highly educated of the apostles, reasoned of righteousness, temperance and judgment to come until his auditor trembled. If a preacher sees plainly, and that is the effect of education, he can make what he sees plain to others. There is a simplicity about profound things which shallow things lack. The well educated man is always simple. It is said of Dr. Alexander, a distinguished professor of theology at Princeton, that he once preached in a rural congregation, and that a simple uneducated farmer who was present went home from the service delighted, and said to his wife that he often had great difficulty in understanding the sermons of his own pastor, but that on this occasion an old man had preached, a stranger, and that he understood every word of the sermon, that the preacher whom he had heard that morning was evidently not any better educated than he was himself. The farmer's remark was repeated to

the great theologian, and he said it was the greatest compliment he had ever received.

A thorough education makes a man more a man, a stronger man, a greater force in the community and in the world. When he talks he knows what he is talking about, and can say the things that take hold, and say them in a way to take hold. Such a man, being equal to the occasion, will take pleasure in his work. Such a man, being apprehended by the truth of the gospel, the greatest thing on earth, will know and feel it strongly, and will be an influential and powerful preacher. Holding the truth, being thoroughly convinced of its truth, he will be able to present it convincingly to others.

It is a man's character, his religion, his piety and devotion to the cause of Christ, his personality, his Christianized personality, which impresses people. And personality is intensified by training. John Calvin was a man of strong personality. But John Calvin was also, as Rousseau testified, "the most Christian man of his time," and John Calvin was the best educated man of his time. He put the stamp of his own personality upon all he said and taught and did. He gave the world the result of his studies, his convictions, in the *Institutes*, which he continually revised and expanded, from his twenty-sixth to his forty-eight year, causing it to grow from six to eighty chapters. He made a great impression upon his audiences and readers. He was a great influence in Geneva, and in the world, because of the intensity of his convictions and the ability, natural and acquired, and the learning, with which he set them forth.

The most practical thing for an advocate, and no less for an advocate of the Christian religion, is to hold the truth of what he believes with the utmost intensity, to believe it with all his heart, and then to argue for its acceptance, with all the ability and learning he can bring to bear on the subject. The preacher's first desire should be to convince his audience of the truth and importance of what he presents. Christianity, with all that legitimately belongs to it, is true. But all men

do not believe it. It is the preacher's task to convince men of its truth and to persuade them to accept it. Many who do not actually, or actively, disbelieve, are not interested in Christianity. It is the preacher's task to awaken their interest. To do this he must thoroughly believe it himself and, what is more, practice it, and then present it with all possible power. His learning, and his complete mastery of the subject in all its branches will, first of all, aid his own convictions, and then give him power to call out conviction in the minds and hearts of those to whom he ministers.

To the people of God, the people transformed by the truth of God, the followers of Jesus Christ, the group of men conscious of divine sonship, the Church, has been committed the ministry of reconciliation. God is in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, and God is in the Church reconciling men to himself, and God is in the minister reconciling men to himself. The minister is the agent of a great propaganda, the mouthpiece of God. He persuades men to avail themselves of the benefits of the gospel of Christ. The Church has the gift of prophecy. Its mission to the world is to make known God in the character of a father waiting to be gracious to men, who are at the same time in the utmost need of divine grace.

There is a universal priesthood of believers. God's people are also prophets. "Your young men shall see visions." "Your sons and your daughters shall prophecy." The prophesying power of the church functions in the ministry. The Master commissioned the apostles after having educated them. They appointed others to assist them while they lived and to carry on the work after they had gone to their reward.

God would have himself made known for men's salvation, as one who is not willing that any should perish, but wills that all should come to a knowledge of the truth, and to an experience of salvation. Jesus came that men might have life and that they might have it abundantly. This ministry—service—of reconciliation has been committed to men called to their work, in the providence of God, by their fellow believers. He

who is called may well say, "Who is sufficient for these things?" "Our sufficiency is of God who also made us sufficient as ministers of a new covenant."

The minister should not look upon his calling as a mere profession. This holds true with regard to every calling. A mechanical performance of any work spells failure. The minister should be a live wire. The voltage is high. The force behind him is great. It is God, willing, having determined, and carrying out the determination, that men should be saved. There must be in the minister no failure to communicate what is at hand to be communicated. There should be no crossed wires. This is of the highest importance.

The world needs the gospel. It needs food also, and medicine and education and legislation and legal advice and the administration of justice; and society sees to it that men are set apart to minister to it in all these ways. But the world needs the gospel of Christ infinitely more. Should the Kingdom of God once be fully established in the hearts of men everywhere, much other service could be dispensed with.

Laws are enacted and administered to restrain and reform the lawless. Where the love of God and of man rules there is no lawlessness. Much sickness is occasioned by a violation of physical laws. A large proportion of this would be avoided if men were the children of the kingdom. Ignorance and sin often go together. A knowledge of God and obedience to his laws is a preventive of sin. The pursuit of vice brings about the need of service of various kinds. The preaching of the gospel and the exercise of the pastoral office, the persuasion of men, all over the world, to repent and reform, to accept the Father's mercy and to order their lives according to his directions, is laying the axe to the root of the tree of evil in the world and fanning out the cause of wretchedness among men and all that stands in the way of happiness and prosperity upon the earth.

Hence the diffusion of the knowledge of God, the knowledge and experience of his mercy and goodness and grace, the

possession of him in the hearts and lives of men everywhere, universally, is the antidote, the anti-toxin, to the poison which for thousands of years has made a large part of the human family sick unto death, spiritually, morally, and physically.

Will a time ever come for example when men and nations will learn war no more? Yes! When the religion of Jesus of Nazareth is everywhere and by all men fully accepted and fully practised. Do Christian nations go to war? Yes! in spite of the measure of the Christianity which prevails among them, and because they are still largely Pagan. It is not Christianity, but the absence of Christianity, which is at the root of the present strife upon the earth. There can be no question of this.

There is every reason in the world, therefore, why the greatest efforts should be made to bring men everywhere, both in heathen and in so-called Christian lands, to accept and live by the Christian religion, both because of the evils it is able to prevent and the blessings it can confer. It is the only power known among men able to overcome sin, man's greatest enemy, and to bring salvation, man's greatest blessing. It comes from our Heavenly Father, whose earnest desire is, with man's coöperation, to bring about the reign of righteousness upon the earth. When this end shall have been reached the world will have been saved, and the human family will continue its career free from the hindrances and limitations which have been such a serious obstruction to its progress since the dawn of history.

The calling and effort of the minister is to bring about in the lives of others what, through the entrance of the light and power of the gospel, has taken place in his own life. Being a man of God and being thoroughly furnished to every good word and work, he exerts himself to Christianize the community in which he is called to labor. His earnest desire, his passion, is to have others become like himself, or rather like his Master. "And Agrippa said unto Paul, with but little persuasion thou wouldst fain make me a Christian. And



Paul said, I would to God, that whether with little or much, not thou only, but all that hear me this day, might become such as I am, except these bonds." The same truth, the same gospel which has had such a great effect for good, such a transforming effect, upon the minister's own life will have a like effect upon the lives of others, when it can be brought in all its power, to bear upon them. Why not? The same nature is possessed by all of us. What is good for one is good for others.

But it is also true that men differ. One yields readily, at least apparently, to the word of truth and to the power and grace of God in the gospel. Another is persuaded with great difficulty, apparently resisting the truth. Still another hardens his heart, and, it seems, will not be convinced. Why? Simply because, in the last analysis, he will not. But the most stubborn wills have been persuaded. The most hostile hearts have been subdued. The skill and power of the preacher and pastor is shown by the success of his efforts with these different classes of men.

The pastor's approaches to men are to be, not necessarily blunt and undiplomatic, but open, and straightforward, and without guile, such as will commend themselves to what is best in those upon whom the effort is made. No ungodly strategy will in the end have a good effect. To bring men to Christ, Christlike methods are needed—Christlike in conception, in manner and process, in purpose and object. One cannot sow tares and reap wheat. One cannot commit a pious fraud in disseminating truth, and expect a harvest of honesty and an upright life.

The preacher's life must be a consecrated and devoted life. His soul must be in his work. The cause is worthy of the best that is in him. He is a servant of the Most High, and of the Most High, with reverence be it said, in the intention and work which are most worthy of him. The result of the preacher's efforts, in as far as there is a result, is the most beneficial to the greatest race, as far as we know, that ever

came into existence. The end to be secured is worthy of the preacher's best efforts because it brings the most valuable benefits to those by nature and capacity best prepared to make worthy use of them. To train and educate for usefulness in life a bright and fine spirited boy is worth while. It is much more worth while to introduce and develop the element of Christianity, or of the Christian religion, in the life of the men and women and children of the race of Adam.

The preacher called of God is adapted for this work. He has a desire to be of service both to him who has called him and to those to whom he is sent. This is one of his first qualifications.

But suppose conditions are favorable to a young man's studying for the ministry. His pastor and his parents wish him to become a minister. No other calling appeals to him very strongly. He feels it to be a duty to give his life to this work. But he does not have the passion for souls, as it is sometimes called. What is he to do? The answer is evident. When a man needs something in his business which he does not possess the wise thing to do is to take measures to acquire it. The only hopeless cases are those in which the would-be servants of a cause are ignorant, and take no means to inform themselves, of what is needed in their work. In the case of one studying for the sacred calling of the gospel ministry the thing to do is to find out what is requisite for success. He will discover that many things are requisite. He must himself be a sincere and earnest and thorough Christian, as already insisted upon. He must be a well developed Christian thoroughly trained in Academy, College and Theological Seminary. Other things being equal, such a training will be a great, perhaps the greatest, factor in his success. But if he has no intense desire to be a successful instrument in the hands of God to bring about the salvation of his fellowmen, an essential element of usefulness is wanting. He ought not enter the ministry without this.

Shall he then give up his purpose to become a preacher and

turn his attention to something else? By no means. He must simply take measures to acquire this qualification for the ministry. "If any of you lacketh wisdom let him ask of God," is the advice of one of the New Testament writers. Why not ask God to create within us a heart enthusiastic for men's deliverance from sin, and that they may become the followers of Christ! When one wills to give his heart to a cause, especially if the cause be a worthy one, he is apt to become interested in it. Association with others who are interested will awaken interest. A study of the literature of the subject, evangelism and missions, the beginnings and growth of the Christian church, is almost sure to generate enthusiasm. The first success is stimulating. Every additional success is an added stimulus. The work of the minister is like hunting, only it results in giving life, instead of taking it, from the hunted. Jesus himself said, in calling some of the disciples, "Follow me and I will make you fishers of men." Fishing is an exciting, stimulating, absorbing occupation or sport, especially when the fishing is good. Every success creates added enthusiasm and desire for further success. There is nothing that so takes one out of oneself and attaches him to a cause. This is also the case in the ministry. The work itself and success in the work largely provide the incentive for further and continued effort.

Preliminary and continued contemplation of the situation is helpful. The facts, as in other things, are to be studied. Here is our Heavenly Father, on the one hand, and his interest in men's welfare, the provision he has made for their safety from the danger of sin and its effects, or their rescue from it of those already under its power. To an extent we have the same mind which is in him. We do not want to see our fellow-men destroy themselves. We can cultivate that feeling of sympathy with the purposes of God. And here, on the other hand, is the human race, neighbors and friends and fellow human beings, the people whose pastor we are about, sooner or later, to become. They need food, medicine, education,

governmental control and protection; but ample provision has been made to secure these for them. They need, more than anything else, the glad tidings of "the lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." They need the blessings which faith in Jesus as Savior and submission to him as Lord will bring. And the Christian minister is the one who is to preach Christ and persuade men to accept him and his help, and to accept him more and more as the days and years pass. It would be a very strange man, and much more a very strange and unnatural Christian who could not bring himself to be interested in such work, and find himself taking pleasure in its success, in seeing one after another coming under the influence of the gospel, giving his heart to the Savior, and growing in spiritual knowledge and grace. If men can become interested and enthusiastic in other callings, and succeed in them, they can most certainly become interested and enthusiastic in the work of the ministry, in bringing the knowledge of God to men, in helping men to put themselves into saving possession of the truth as it is in Jesus. The uninterested, the unenthusiastic minister, or student for the ministry, if there be such an one, must have a heart of stone, and ought to have chosen, and failed, in some other calling in life, for there certainly is no worthy calling in which such a man could have the remotest chance of success.

It is a great privilege to live near to God. Enoch walked with God. Many others have done so, and many are doing so today. We have God's word to study, coming to us through the hearts and minds of his servants, men, on the one hand, of like passions with ourselves, but men, on the other hand, God-possessed and God-inspired, those who gave us what they had to say in the sacred scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and many others. We can commune with God in the reading of his word, the literature of the Israelites, a people with a remarkable genius for truth and righteousness, in a study of the life and teachings of Jesus and his apostles, and the hymns and liturgies and literature of the Church. Filling

our minds and hearts with these is an inspiration and a stimulus which cannot fail to bring enthusiasm for the work of building up the kingdom by bringing men into saving communication with the God of all grace.

There is nothing peculiar about this. The same thing precisely holds true in other things. Is a man a bridge builder and disposed to be uninterested and to look upon his work as drudgery? What he needs to do is to saturate himself with the literature of his profession, to study the great triumphs which others have achieved in this work. If that does not bring him enthusiasm he is simply an impossible engineer. The sooner he gives up all claims to the calling the better for him and for those who might be disposed to employ him.

The higher one goes the greater the means of stimulation at hand. Is it literature for which one has an inclination? There is Addison and Johnson and Dickens and Thackeray and Scott and Motley and Bancroft and Froude and Hume and Shakespeare and Virgil and Homer. The study of their works will not only inform, present models, but inspire to the production of similar works, to the extent of the student's capacity. Has one chosen teaching as a profession, the instruction of the youth of the community, the formation in their minds of processes and modes of thought, the development of the human intellect and, to an extent, the building up of human character? The study of the literature of the profession and the results achieved by others cannot fail to create enthusiasm for the work. We are coming to human life here, a vital sphere of existence, not of vegetable or animal existence, or of beauty in art, but of life, and that the highest in the whole creation. There is inspiration in the study of the history, processes, and results of education such as is not to be found in the study of mining, manufacturing, building railroads or cities, of Baron Hausman or Christopher Wren, or of anything which has to do with material or mechanical things.

How much easier then ought it to be to create in ourselves

an enthusiasm for that which is of the very highest with which we can have to do: the spread of divine truth, the truth of that which is divinest in man and in the world, the inculcation of a love for, and the practice of a divine righteousness, the preaching of a divine gospel, the announcement of a divine kingdom, something which has not only to do with man, but with man in relation to his God, to Christian character, to salvation, to eternal life. Just as the Christian ministry is the highest calling in the world, so the reasons for earnestness in this work and the means at hand for the awakening and promotion of enthusiasm for the work are the most abundant.

There is one thing, however, that must be kept in mind in a discussion like this. Man and the gospel are mutually complementary. We have all heard of Herbert Spencer's famous remark: "There is something in man that maketh for righteousness." Dr. Gerhart was accustomed to say, "The word of God authenticates itself." The fact is, as we all know, the human heart and conscience respond to the teaching of God's word. Of Moses and those to whom he was sent it is said: "And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people": And they said, "All that the Lord hath spoken will we do, and be obedient."

However, the Church, up to this time has not been universally successful. The Christian religion has not been always and everywhere and by all men accepted. Much effort and persuasion has been employed for centuries and perhaps the greater part of the task before the Church is still unaccomplished. Progress has been made from the beginning. The number of the disciples has steadily increased. Every century has become more Christian than the one preceding it. And yet the work of evangelizing the world is far from being completed. The gospel has not been preached in all the districts among all nations, and where it has been preached multitudes have refused to yield to its claims.

But from the beginning in every place where Christ was preached many believed on him. It is no argument against



his supreme value to men that the majority have not believed. A college education is among the best things in our civilization. But many young men turn away from it by their own choice.

The gospel appeals to men, they themselves, in the best examples of the race, being judges. It is what they need. Nothing better has ever appeared in the world. Jesus of Nazareth was absolutely the best man that ever lived. In character and life he is not to be surpassed. His righteousness is absolute and his philanthropy had no reservations. Many see this who are not, except to that extent, Christians.

There was a time when the preaching of the gospel was about the only agency for the advocacy of righteousness and unselfishness in the world. Now there are many such agencies. Uprightness, truthfulness, disinterestedness, service to others, obedience to a higher law than that of selfinterest, are recognized as of supreme worth by many who have never openly professed to be followers of the Nazarene. Morality, may we not say, Christian morality, is practiced in our games. To be a sport is to give your opponent in a contest an equal chance with yourself—a square deal. It is considered unmanly even to shoot wild animals when they are not aware of the hunter's presence.

The newspapers advocate unselfishness. Arguments for it are heard in our legislative assemblies and in the messages of governors and presidents. A man in office, in these days, stains his record when he uses his position to enrich himself or to benefit his relatives. Public office is acknowledged to be a public trust.

All this falls in with the religion of Christ, if it does not directly grow out of it, a religion which the Christian minister is engaged in establishing. But sometimes it is regarded as undermining the minister's influence or taking away something from the importance of his calling. But this is a mistake. It adds to the success of his work. It is a reinforcement. On a certain occasion in the history of Moses, two men, Eldad and Medad, who were not in the Tent of Meeting,

prophesied in the camp. And Joshua said: "My Lord Moses, forbid them." But Moses said: "Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets." In the days of Jesus, on a certain occasion, John said to him: "Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name and we forbade him, because he followed not us." But Jesus said: "Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a mighty work in my name and be able quickly to speak evil of me." This indicates our true position. All such things are a proof of the truth of the gospel, an unintended confirmation of its value to men. They are a partial acceptance of it. The minister alone brings to men in its perfection what they at their best have been looking for and which they, somewhat blindly, are trying to realize.

In as far as what has been spoken of comes out in the hearts and consciences of men themselves and in their words and acts, spontaneously, it is proof that the gospel is the thing men want. In as far as it is the result of Christ's and the Church's teachings it shows that they are accepting these in part, and that indicates that they may accept them in their fullness eventually. The minister should regard the teaching of the school and college and the public press and the law-making and law-administering organizations on morality, and an awakening public conscience, as strong aids in his work, and with all the more zeal because of them, continue to preach Christ and him crucified as the highest example of self-sacrificing love for man's welfare, Jesus and the resurrection, as the earnest of the final triumph of good over evil, of life over death, with unlimited confidence that Jesus must reign until all enemies are put under his feet. What greater encouragement could we have in our work than to know that the unchristian or only partly christianized world is coming to see and act in some measure, in harmony with the ethical teachings of our Lord. Sometime the partly christianized world will become wholly Christian. It is a great privilege to have even a small part in bringing this about.

The Christian minister as the spiritual head of a congrega-

tion holds a strategic position. His occupying the office implies that he is a man of the highest Christian character. He is listened to with respect, in and out of the pulpit. He sustains relations of various kinds; and the knowledge of God and what it has brought about in his life gives him standing and power in them. He is a preacher of Christ—a herald of the cross. He is a teacher of Christian ethics. He is a man of prayer. He conducts public worship. He lives near to God, and when he approaches him, as the mouthpiece of the congregation, he does so as a powerful ambassador, as one who is on terms of communion and friendship with him to whom the prayers are addressed.

He sustains a relation to the children of the community. With the parents, and his helpers, the teachers and officers of the Sunday school, he prepares them for a public profession of faith in Christ. Going before them in the way of Christian example, he is a model of daily conduct. He gathers them into classes for personal instruction. It was an evil hour, says Dr. Faunce, when in some groups of Christians public exhortation took the place of catechetical instruction, and fervor was substituted for a knowledge of divine things. Public appeals to come to Jesus should not be set aside, emotion enters into religion as it does into family relationships and patriotism; but it cannot take the place but is rather the result, of knowledge. Repetition of gospel truths, earnestness in insisting on the acceptance of them, will call out a response. The love of God, faithfully presented, shed abroad in the hearts of young and old, as their hearts open for its reception, will awaken love to God. "We love him because he first loved us." "The love of Christ constraineth us." But Christian emotions, love to our Heavenly Father and to our Savior, Jesus Christ, and to our fellowmen for his sake, do not find their strongest expression in outward demonstrations of enthusiasm, in shouts of hallelujah, but in acts of devotion and service. All this is impressed upon the children and youth of the community in the efforts made to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

The minister sustains a relation to the community. If he is located in a village or small place he is often its first citizen. He may be the only college man in the place. He is prominent because he is the public instructor in religion and an example of a correct moral life. He is a trained public speaker and on many occasions is called upon to make addresses on subjects other than the gospel, to give expression to what is in the mind of the community, or to say what has not been fully thought out by his fellow citizens, and to correct erroneous views. But his chief office even to those not identified with the Church is that of a preacher of the gospel, becoming all things to all men that, in St. Paul's way of putting it, he may save some. Can we not improve on that, however, and say, that he may save all the people in the community. Richard Baxter labored at Kidderminster, it is said, until every one in his parish had confessed Christ.

In a larger place the ministers, both in their individual capacity, and as a body of men, the Ministerial Association, are a power for good. A body of several hundred or a thousand preachers in a large city are a force to be reckoned with on a question within their province, as public instructors, leaders of thought. They are very influential and should be very useful members of society. What a force for civic righteousness such a body of men, if they are alive to their opportunities, may be. Of trained intellect, of high character, followers of Christ, devoted to the service of God and of men, mighty in word and deed, they stand for that which is best in life, and ought to be able to swing a whole city into the Christian ranks, laboring with all their culture and strength that the kingdom of satan may be broken down and that truth may be acknowledged and righteousness be practiced.

It may be asked why more has not been accomplished, why the results of the Church's work have not been greater. Years ago this would have been attributed to total depravity. But it is said, that doctrine is no longer believed in, except by the man whose next door neighbor has a family of bad boys. A

great reason for this hindrance to success is the existence and activity of the kingdom of satan, to which allusion has just been made. Evil is active and aggressive as well as good. There are tendencies in the human heart adverse to the Christian religion. It interferes with the gratification of wicked desires. To imitate Herbert Spencer's saying: There is something in man that maketh for iniquity. Many labor for the overthrow and hindering of gospel truth, while others are exerting themselves for its establishment. Much effort must be expended in defence as well as in aggression. After the Civil War a soldier was asked why a regiment, firing upon the enemy, did not do more execution—why it took almost as many pounds of lead to kill a man as the man himself weighed. The reply was that it must be remembered that while you were shooting at another man he was shooting at you, and that interfered very much with the accuracy of your aim. So in the work of the Christian ministry. It is a war with evil, as well as a constructive life-long and age-long campaign to build up the Kingdom of God. We labor to defeat the efforts continually made to lead men into vice, as well as to persuade them to follow the good.

As a preacher and pastor the minister has access to the homes of his people and largely to the homes of the community. He is the friend of the family. His presence is desired at the bedside of the sick. He soothes the last hours of those departing this life by rehearsing in their ears the rich promisee of the word of God, and by commending their souls to their Heavenly Father in prayer, in the article of death. He speaks words of consolation at the interment of the bodies of the dead to those who have been bereaved of their presence, and visits and comforts the mourners in their sorrow. It is perhaps better to be strong as a pastor than as a preacher. But there is no reason why one should not be strong both in the pulpit and in the house of suffering. To conduct public service, to preach, to teach from the pulpit, in the home, and in the catechetical class, to visit the people, to pray for and with the

people, to comfort them in distress, to labor to make known the Scriptures, to awaken faith in Christ, to turn men from folly and iniquity, to lead them to practice virtue and righteousness, to serve God, to support his kingdom, the minister has most certainly a great opportunity to make his life count for good. For these things the Christian preacher stands, by his own choice. For them he has received his training. For them the Church has set him apart. He will be eminent or of little account in the degree in which he succeeds or fails in doing them.

There is much social intercourse between pastor and people. They meet on the street and exchange greetings. They visit each other's families and take an interest in one another's plans, in their joys as well as sorrows, in the education and progress of the children, in work and play. The pastor sits with his people at the family fireside, or at the family table, on Thanksgiving or Christmas. He is present and officiates at the daughters' weddings and makes jokes or tells stories, helps along the hilarity and the fun in "the feast of reason and the flow of soul." Here he can make his cultivated Christian personality felt and influence young and old to a higher appreciation and a fuller acceptance of the religion of Christ. In a sense all visiting by the pastor is pastoral visiting, though not a word be spoken directly on the subject of divine revelation, on the part of God, or of repentance and faith and obedience and service on the part of man.

Is the minister always to remember, and never to forget, that he is a man of God, a servant of Christ, a priest and prophet of the Most High? He is to be this so thoroughly as to make any effort to remember it unnecessary. He is to be so saturated with the truth of God and with the love of his fellow-men, as to carry these with him wherever he goes and into every group of men with whom he mingles. His ministry is not to be laid aside with any particular ministerial vestment which he might choose to wear in his official capacity at the altar and in the pulpit. In some European countries the



priests wear a shovel hat and a robe reaching to their heels on the streets. They carry the insignia of office with them. The Protestant minister should carry his ministerial heart wherever he goes.

The minister is an individual and has individual characteristics. A liberal education broadens him and enables him to adapt himself, to an extent, to all classes and conditions of men. But whilst this is true, it is also true that an education, an enlargement and intensification of his personality, may make his peculiarities, at least some of them, more pronounced, not so much the surface peculiarities perhaps as those which lie deeper. And it is often these peculiarities, his way of approaching a subject, his method of presenting truth, the way in which he grasps things and argues about them and sets them forth, that appeals strongly to some men. A rugged character, calling it that for want of a better term, will make a greater impression upon men of like rugged character than one not so rugged.

The minister should be first of all a man, a manly man, not an anæmic creature. Thomas Hughes, the author of *Tom Brown at Rugby* and of *Tom Brown at Oxford*, wrote a pamphlet on the *Manliness of Christ*. It is disappointing to those who have read the Tom Brown books. Instead of using the word manliness in its usual, perhaps American sense, he used it to express the human nature of Christ. There is room for an essay on the manliness of Christ, using the word as we do, Christ was manly, a strong man, a manly man, a virile man, a rugged man. If a better, more expressive word were known, it would be used here. It is likely that Jesus had a strong face. Joshua no doubt had and Joab and Judas Maccabæus, as had George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, and as has Woodrow Wilson. The man who impersonated the Christ in the Passion Play at Oberammergau in 1910, was disappointing in this particular. The face of Judas Iscariot and that of Pontius Pilate, were strong, full of character, the kind of character for which they stood. The face

of the man, who impersonated the Christ, was the reverse of strong or striking. It was probably in the minds of those who made the selections from those available for the different parts, that the Christ should be a blending of all excellencies, and they seemed to have hit on a man whose face expressed the absence of vices, it is true, but also the absence of great virtues, whose face and form and manner and tone of voice were ineffectual. Such a man as Mr. Lang seemed to be would make no bitter enemies and no friends loyal unto death. Jesus did both. His enemies had him crucified. His friends suffered martyrdom for his sake. He was a strong man, bitterly hated and greatly loved.

In like manner the minister ought to be of vigorous and manly makeup in body and health, of a strong and active mind, holding all his opinions with all his heart and ready to defend them against all comers, and of a virile and aggressive piety, and a burning zeal for goodness and the kingdom of God.

What then is to become of the weakly and anæmic student of theology? Let him train his body into physical vigor and strength. We have an example of what can be done along this line in the case of Ex-President Roosevelt. If the student has not the will-power to train perhaps the sooner he goes to the scrap-pile the better. A man's manliness ought to be accentuated rather than eliminated by his education and by his religion. The minister's manliness will help him gain many admirers and friends for himself, his Church and the Master. And they will be friends worth having. "*Gleich und gleich gesellt sich gern.*"

But whilst such a man will make a strong appeal to most men he will most likely also repel a few. He will make enemies. But this is also sometimes helpful. All who are engaged in and thrive by immorality will hate such a man. And sometimes they will be able to interfere with his usefulness.

It is perhaps not best for a minister to remain a great many

years in the same community. Something depends on the man and something on the people. The itinerancy may have its weaknesses, but it also has its strength. Under this system the Methodist Episcopal Church became a large and efficient body of believers in a century and a quarter in the United States. One man may get a certain class of people into the Church but will not succeed with others although his antagonism to their way of life may have set them thinking. His successor, between whom and them there has been no passage at arms, who has no personal prejudices to overcome in them, may be able to lead them to Christ. Yes, a new broom sweeps clean! Certainly! That is the reason housewives discard the old one from time to time and get a new one. The Church should not be less wise.

There are of course two extremes. Some men move too often. Others do not move often enough. Few men and few communities are so constituted as to make it advisable for them to remain together during the lifetime of the pastor. No regular rule can be laid down that will fit every case. We might find it wise to strive after the golden men.

But is there not, after all, much of failure in the minister's work? Certainly! The minister fails to realize his ideals, right along. These could not have been very high if this were not so. The success which he desires, and for which he prays and labors, does not always come to him, at least in the large measure for which he hopes. But every faithful preacher and pastor, following on to know the Lord, and to imitate him, using his attainments and his positions to lead men to Christ and to guide and stimulate them in the narrow way and in Christian service, will succeed. His preaching and his prayers for his people, and his efforts for their spiritual advancement will not be in vain.

When an aged pastor returns, after years of absence, to the place of his early labors, he is often made to feel by the overwhelming testimony of those still living and by their expressions of gratitude to him that he had done much good and

that he and his work were highly appreciated. In the gospel ministry there is a heavenly treasure in earthen vessels. The vessels may be of little value, and will, in a sense, perish eventually, but the treasure is great, and endures. It is of the nature of seed, which grows and multiplies. The word of God, however inadequately presented, in pastoral intercourse, in wayside and house to house ministrations, and from altar and pulpit, will not be fruitless. "My word shall not return empty." "He that goeth forth and weepeth bearing precious seed shall doubtless come again rejoicing bringing his sheaves with him." It is the minister's calling to preach and administer the gospel of Christ the Son of God, a divine message for men's salvation, the medicine for moral corruption, a small portion of which cannot but have an infinitely beneficial effect. And that effect for good in the lives of men and women and children is the minister's exceeding great reward.

McKEESPORT, PA.

## V.

### "LEAD, KINDLY LIGHT."

RALPH E. HARTMAN.

Hymns are a very valuable and inspiring part of our worship. From the earliest areas of history, religion has been joined to song. From the rude howlings of savage medicine men, to the Levitical choir of the ancient temples, to the angelic choir proclaiming, "peace on earth, goodwill to men," to the Protestant Reformation, to the time of Wesley, Watts, Newman, Lyte, Heber and Harbaugh, to the worshipping congregations of this twentieth century, men have been singing praises and prayers to their God. For centuries men have been putting the richest thoughts of their lives and the most devout expressions of their souls into sacred poetry and hymns. The messages of life and death, faith, hope and love, comfort, joy and guidance expressed in so many of our hymns will live forever.

With but few exceptions do all our masterpieces of sacred hymnology reveal the life and spirit of the author. Many of them show that they were written in times of trial and trouble and sorrow and depression of mind and heart. One almost can feel that these rich gems of Christian thought and praise are the expressions of a crushed and broken heart. Just as the most fragrant spices will not yield their precious perfumes until they are crushed and bruised—even so it seems with the human heart.

The subject of our thought and discussion is one of the masterpieces of sacred song, inspired by sickness, suffering and weariness of the soul. A hymn which is precious and near to many Christian lives. A hymn that stands as a beacon in the darkness of doubt and despair, as a guide through the

storm and struggles of life. A hymn which will never cease to be sung until God's children sing the new song in heaven. "Lead Kindly Light."

Its distinguished author, John Henry Newman, was born February 21, 1801, in the city of London. His father was a banker. His mother was of French Protestant extraction, a devout and godly woman. Newman was brought up to take great delight in the Bible and to read books of Calvinistic theology. At the early age of nineteen he was graduated from Trinity College, Oxford, and became a tutor in Oriel College. He was ordained in 1824 and in 1828 was made rector of St. Mary's Protestant Episcopal Church, Oxford. In December, 1832, because his health was suffering from much overwork, he went with friends to southern Europe. While on this trip this hymn was written. In 1845 Newman united with the Roman Catholic Church, the causes of which do not concern us here. His life was one of earnest service in the Roman Catholic Church, and in 1879 he became a cardinal in the Roman Catholic Church. Cardinal Newman died August 11, 1890, fifty-seven years after this hymn made his name immortal.

It is surely remarkable that a man who wrote so many books and who filled so large a place in the intellectual and religious life of more than two generations, should be remembered more by one hymn of three stanzas than on account of all else whatsoever. The life of John Henry Newman may pass away, but not the spirit of his life which lives in this hymn and through it is instrumental in bringing light to some darkened life, guidance to some wayward soul, comfort to some burdened heart, and courage to some hopeless youth on the threshold of life.

To us it is a matter of small importance but a fact that is interesting and worth knowing, that "Lead Kindly Light" was not written by Cardinal Newman as generally spoken. It was written by Newman while he was still a minister of the Church of England. The hymn was written twelve years before



the author united with the Roman Catholic Church and forty-six years before he became a cardinal.

Perhaps nothing more fully illustrates the general knowledge and acceptability of this universal hymn than the fact that "when the Parliament of Religion met in Chicago during the Columbian Exposition, the representatives of almost every creed known to man found two things on which they were agreed: They could all join in the Lord's Prayer and all could sing *"Lead Kindly Light."* Its sincerity of feeling and purity of expression have made it universally acceptable.

The hymn *"Lead Kindly Light"* was written on Sunday evening, June 16, 1833. Newman has left us this very entertaining description of the circumstances under which his hymn was written: He says, I went to the various coasts of the Mediterranean; parted with my friends at Rome; went down for the second time to Sicily, without companion at the end of April. I struck into the middle of the island, and fell ill of a fever at Leonforte. My servant thought I was dying and begged for my last directions, I gave them, as he wished but I said *"I shall not die."* I repeated *"I shall not die, for I have not sinned against the Light; I have not sinned against the Light."* I got to Castro-Giovanni, and was laid up there for nearly three weeks. Toward the end of May I left for Palermo, taking three days for the journey. I was aching to get home; yet for want of a vessel, I was kept at Palermo for three weeks. I began to visit the churches, and they calmed my impatience, though I did not attend any of the services. At last I got off in an orange boat bound for Marseilles. Then it was that I wrote the lines *"Lead Kindly Light."*

So much for the author and the immediate circumstances of writing the hymn and now as to the hymn so dear to many Christian hearts. It was a passionate appeal for divine direction, uttered by a troubled and earnest soul. In this hymn which was the outcome of a long and painful mental and spiritual struggle, he says,

Lead, kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom, Lead Thou me on;  
The night is dark, and I am far from home; Lead Thou me on:  
Keep Thou my feet; I do not ask to see

The distant scene,—one step enough for me.

So long Thy power hath blest me, sure it still will lead me on;  
I loved to choose and see my path; but now Lead Thou me on.  
I loved the garish day, and, spite of fears,

Pride ruled my will: remember not past years.

So long Thy power hath blest me, sure it still will lead me on;  
O'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent, till the night is gone;

And with the morn those angel faces smile,

Which I have loved long since, and lost awhile.

In reading this petition of a doubt-tossed soul for stability and guidance in life's way, one cannot help but feel the sincerity of the author's prayer for divine guidance. I do not know of any song, ancient or modern, that with such combined tenderness, pathos and faith, tells the story of the Christian pilgrim who walks by faith, not by sight. Neither can I think, that the sunset which inspired Newman to write this hymn as it was descending in the Italian sky sinking into the sea, could have been any richer or more gorgeous than some which we experience at the present day, when it sets amid the flood of crimson and gold, bathing the clouds in splendor and opening up visions of beauty unsuspected in the garish light of noonday—I say it was more than the light of the setting sun—it was his feeling of dependence on God, his realization of Him who is the Way, the Truth and the Life—his knowledge of the spirit of life and love of the "light of the world."

Let us look at the first verse more closely—

Lead, kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom, Lead Thou me on;  
The night is dark, and I am far from home; Lead Thou me on:  
Keep Thou my feet; I do not ask to see

The distant scene,—one step enough for me.

I interpret the Light as referred to divine guidance—the Light of the Holy Spirit, which does lead men from the darkness of sin into the light of love, from the wilderness of doubt

and death into the arena of faith and life. That one of the functions of the Holy Spirit is to lead and cast the light of God for His wayward children as well as those consecrated souls who are walking in the light and praying for its continuance, is also alluded to in our hymnal—

Blest Comforter divine, Let rays of heavenly love,  
Amid our gloom and darkness shine, And guide our souls above.

Come, gracious Spirit, heavenly Dove, With light and comfort from  
above,  
Be thou my guardian, Thou my guide, O'er every thought and step  
preside.

Come as the light, to us reveal, Our sinfulness and woe,  
And lead us in those paths of life, Where all the righteous go.

The master said, I am the light of the world, he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life. Thus the thought of the Holy Spirit as a guide leading men to God is not foreign to us, but near and helpful. Amid the encircling gloom of this twentieth century, we need the guidance of this Light, and must pray too, that it shall lead us.

The gloom that encircled the author was sickness, the sadness of depression, nights of homesickness and loneliness, the dark thoughts of the Church to which he still clung. He prays for the guidance of the Light that shall lead him to cheer, to the morning of joy in heaven's day, which he has loved long since and lost awhile.

For us, amid the gloomy clouds of war, amid "the blackness of the noon day night" of sin and selfishness and Sabbath desecration, amid the seemingly increasing shadows of moral indifference and insincere devotion to the things of good and of God, we too need this Light to lead us, we need more of the warmth of its rays and the light of its beams. We need it because "it will show us plainly of the Father," it will guide us to do His will on earth as it is done in heaven, it will fill the "dark with excessive bright" as Milton says. It will give us faith to set our faces to the distant scenes,

and our hearts to obey His commandments. It will give us confidence to brave the howling voices of the darkness. Whittier says:

A tender child of summers three,  
Seeking her little bed at night,  
Paused on the dark stair timidly,  
"Oh, mother! take my hand," said she  
"And then the dark will all be light."

We older children grope our way  
From dark behind to dark before;  
And only when our hands we lay,  
Dear Lord, in Thine, the night is day,  
And there is darkness nevermore.

Reach downwards to the sunless days,  
Wherein our guides are blind as we,  
And faith is small and hope delays;  
Take Thou the hands of prayer we raise,  
And let us feel the light of Thee.

We too must pray "Lead, Kindly Light, Lead Thou us on."  
We too must have the confidence and trust of the child—  
"Mother take my hand, and then the dark will all be bright."

It may be that this hymn is such a universal favorite because it gives expression to heart experiences so common to us all. There are dark nights, and homesick hours and becalmed seas for each of us in which it is natural for man to cry out in Newman's words—The night is dark, and I am far from home, Lead Thou me on; Keep Thou my feet; I do not ask to see the distant scene—one step enough for me.

Newman here gives expression to the same unconquerable faith in divine guidance that the Master did in Gethsemane, "Not my will, but Thine." For the Master the night was dark, but all was bright within,—He had faith in the will of God. He knew from whence cometh His strength and His light to find the Father's home. Even though betrayed and denied and criticized and crucified, His prayer too must have been—Lead Thou me on—"Father into Thy hands I commend my Spirit."

We too pray that this same Light will lead us, though the night is dark, may it lead us, though we love to choose and see our path. Will it? Can it? Can this *kindly* light lead us through the *cruel* dark clouds of war and the perplexing problems of the peace conference? It can, and more than that, if it is God's will that all nations shall be led to honor and righteousness, and justice and love, it is only this kindly Light that can lead them—nations *must* follow where this Light leads if they are ever to arrive at God's ideal of international relationship—his ideal of universal brotherhood. May the day soon come when all nations shall take this Light as the light of their life in dealing with themselves and their neighbors. Take this Light as the lamp of their steps leading them upward to a higher moral life and onward to eternal life. May all nations soon put on the armor of Light.

To read Chaplain Tiplady's books, *The Cross at the Front* and *The Soul of the Soldier* convinces one that the individual men on the fields of battle are not indifferent to this Light. They want to be led by it, they realize its value and helpfulness, they want to be found in its brilliancy as they "go west," or even as they face the distant scene. Thus in this twentieth century, when the roar of cannons and guns can be heard as never before, when the din of battle seems darker than ever, when the home of peace seems farther away than ever before, this Light leads on—on to a brighter horizon—on to a holier and happier life, where nations shall know and honor the God of mercy and love and peace.

Lead, Kindly Light—lead Thou us on. "Lead us out of the shadow into light, out of death in to life, out of war into peace."

Light reveals as well as guides. Light casts its beams behind us as well as before us. Newman must have felt this also as he was writing, he says:

I was not ever thus, nor prayed that Thou Shouldst lead me on;

I loved to choose and see my path; but now Lead Thou me on.

I loved the garish day, and spite of fears,

Pride ruled my will: remember not past years.

In this verse we hearken to the voice of confession as well as the voice of petition. This verse reveals to us in another way the kindness of the Light. Even though for a while we lose sight of the Light, even though for a while we do not walk in its way, nor live in its light, that does not say that this Light does not shine for us. God is no respecter of persons, He causeth His Light to shine on the just and the unjust. We need but to place ourselves in the rays of His Light and it will warm these cold hearts of ours. It will guide these lives of ours to Him, through the way of true life, just as the light of the star led the wise men to Bethlehem. If we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and if we express a desire to possess His Spirit and walk in His steps—this Light—this kindly Light shall lead us,—even though we loved to choose our own way, and even though we loved the garish day. The Light was kind to Saul, it will be just as kind to us all, if we like he, follow the commands of the Lord, if we follow in the brightness of the Light, if the wicked turn from his way and live.

With Newman we need this Light to lead us on—who of us cannot look back to the time of self will and pride, when we chose our own way rather than God's way, when the sport of the garish day fascinated us or as Pope says, "pleased with a rattle, tickled with a straw"—who of us cannot find room in our thoughts for the confession and prayer—Pride ruled my heart—remember not past years. We need not wait until old age or until the angel of death hovers near us to pray the prayer—remember not past years—lead Thou me on.

I question if it is not something of a misfortune that this hymn has come to be used so prevailingly as a funeral hymn. Why not take it as a young man's hymn? Here is a young man on the threshold of life, looking through the open door, he hears the din and sees the dust of battle, with brave heart he accepts the challenge of the horizon, which he sees across the valley Humiliation and beyond the hill Difficulty, and his heart is filled with hope and he prays "Kindly Light, lead



Thou me on." Can't we take the reverence of the hymn as the reverence and prayer at the beginning of life as well as at the end? Can't the sublime stillness of the hymn suggest the stillness before the storm and struggle of life? Can't this be a prayer for guidance at the dawn of life as well as at its eventide—it seems to me if we would stress this hymn as a prayer for guidance through life rather than guidance at death, as so many people do, it would become dearer and more helpful to many who need the guidance and comfort of this Light not on the bed of death but on the battlefield of life.

Many another hymn is far better adapted to carry comfort and consolation to the bereaved. This hymn is to strengthen and lighten those who are facing life. Its outlook is not the heavens about to receive the weary pilgrim, but rather the long stretches of a common earthly life with all its moral moors and fens and spiritual crags and torrents where men are likely to lose life's meaning and wander from life's true way. Do not misunderstand me, I am not unmindful of the untold cheer and courage and comfort this hymn has brought to those "who have gone before us in the way of salvation, by whom we are now compassed about, in our Christian course, as a cloud of witnesses looking down upon us from the heavenly world"—but it does seem to me that this hymn can give more cheer and courage and comfort if found by youth opening life's door than it can when he closes life's door, and passes on into "the other room." If this kindly Light is found and followed in life it will not be forgotten nor will it fail at death. So, would that we could have more of our people join in the quest of this Light, early in life. May they "seek until they find it" and then follow where it leads and with a long life satisfy Him, thus fulfilling the purpose for which they have been created. With Whittier do we ask:

What asks our Father of His children, save  
Justice and mercy and humility,  
A reasonable service of good deeds,

Pure living, tenderness to human needs  
 Reverence and trust, and prayer for light to see  
 The Master's footprints in our daily ways?

and with Newman do we pray Kindly Light, lead Thou us on.

It must be the gleam of hope, undying, invincible hope, in the last verse which has seized hold of the heart of mankind in every land; for whatever failures and disappointments life may have had for us, however broken into fragments the ambitions of youth—this kindly Light causes hope to spring immortal in the human breast and a remembrance of divine mercy in the past encourages the tempted, the wayward, the stained, the travel-worn pilgrim to sing

So long Thy power hath blest me, sure it still will lead me on  
 O'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent, till the Night is gone;  
 And with the morn those angel faces smile,  
 Which I have loved long since, and lost awhile.

Thus Newman closes his immortal work with a grand declaration of triumphant, childlike faith and assurance, that the Light will lead him on—even till the night is gone, regardless of what the darkness may hold, or the prince of darkness may bring forth. So for we pilgrims of life, 'tis the strength and joy of His love and the guidance and glow of this Light—the kindly Light, that encourages us and enables us to find our way through the moor's and fens of life, and mount the crags and cross the torrents and thus be found in "the great world's altar stairs, that slope through darkness up to God" [Tennyson]. Surely it is a kindly Light—that leads us through the conflicts and struggles of life's day, through the temptations and dangers of night's darkness—to the morn that ushers in the day when death is swallowed up in victory—the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.

Is there any other Light that is so kind? Is there any other Light that leads where this Light of God leads? Is there any other Light that brightens our own life and our home life as this Light brightens? Is there any other Light that

marks the ways of happiness and service, of honor and brotherhood as does this kindly Light? With a true heart and full assurance of faith we say, no. Then let us cling to this Light of our Father in Heaven as a child walking in the night clings to his father's hand. Let us follow where He leads—

He leads us on by paths we did not know;  
Upward He leads us, though our steps be slow,  
Though oft we faint and falter on the way,  
Though storms and darkness oft obscure the day,  
Yet when the clouds are gone,  
We know He leads us on.

He leads us through all th' unquiet years;  
Past all our dreamland hopes, and doubts and fears,  
He guides our steps, through all the tangled maze  
Of losses, sorrows, and o'erclouded days;  
We know His will is done;  
And still He leads us on.

And He, at last, after the weary strife,  
After the restless fever we call life,  
After the dreariness, the aching pain,  
The wayward struggles which have proved in vain,  
After our toils are past,  
Will give us rest at last.

Lead, kindly Light, Lead Thou humanity on.

MARYSVILLE, PA.

## VI.

### THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF DENOMINATIONALISM.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

We shall be able to estimate aright the relative value of the present order in church and state and forecaste the trend of its future development in the light of its origin and growth. The historical background of the modern age is medieval Europe whose political and ecclesiastical ideal was a world-wide empire with a uniform government and religion for all the nations of the earth. In this scheme of cosmopolitanism there was no place for nationalism or denominationalism. It was a revival of the Roman empire supported by divine sanctions and clad in ecclesiastical robes. The two terms, descriptive of the aim and scope of pagan Rome, were appropriated by Christian Rome, namely,—universality and eternity. The authority for such dominion was not based upon the consent of the governed but upon divine right reënforced by human might. The purpose of empire was to realize in visible form through the vice-gerents of heaven, emperor and pope, the kingdom of God upon earth. Hence the name, Holy Roman Empire. Every phase of human life, politics, religion, morals, art, philosophy, the individual and the group, was regulated by God through His anointed.

Uniformity of religious belief and practice, in this plan of empire, was more than a distant vision. It became an actual fact in medieval catholicism. The Latin language was in common use in worship and in literature. The same holy offices were performed at every shrine from Bergen to Palermo, from Königsberg to Madrid. Priests and monks were equally at home in every land from the North Sea to

the Mediterranean. Scholars wandered from Bologna to Oxford, from Paris to Salamanca, and heard in different universities from men of different race the same ideas in the same tongue. In the service of the church and in ecclesiastical preferment, men were not hedged in by national boundaries or traditions. Gerbert, a Frenchman, became archbishop of Ravenna in Italy; Lanfranc, an Italian, became archbishop of Canterbury in England; the German Norbert established a new order of canons in France. Men of many nations united in the armies of the crusaders. The hope of a *respublica christiana*, the kingdom of God on earth ruled by pope and emperor in the name of Jesus Christ, was at the point of fulfillment when new forces came into control which wrought decay and dissolution.

Universal empire never fails to kindle the imagination and to cast a spell over the human spirit. Notwithstanding its repeated failures, in ancient and medieval times, it has been revived in so widely different forms as the humanitarianism of Comte, the socialism of Marx, and the militarism of the Hohenzollerns. The periodic revival of the dream of universalism in government and in religion, spite of its failures, indicates a reason for it in the nature of things. It is an earnest, though misguided, attempt to put in corporate form the innate sense of the unity of God and of humanity, the irrepressible feeling that there is

"One God, one law, one element,  
And one far-off divine event,  
To which the whole creation moves."

However sincere the attempt at uniformity of civil and religious institutions, it will always fail because it disregards the claims of individualism and of nationalism, which are as deeply rooted in human nature as the aspirations to universalism. A uniform cosmopolitanism fails to develop the infinite variety of mental, moral, religious, political, and aesthetic life which lies dormant in tribes and nations. The

individual, the particular, the specific, with its priceless value, fascinating beauty, and absorbing interest, is suppressed for the maintenance of a colorless and dull uniformity. No room is left for self-expression and self-realization in individual and national life, for which men have always become heroes and martyrs. The experience of history assures us that an ideal born of fancy without basis in fact is unreal and impracticable; and efforts to enforce it in life must end in obscuration, distortion, and compromise. This was the outcome of the Holy Roman Empire, too holy to be Roman and too Roman to be holy. The compact between pope and emperor, vicars of Christ on earth, turned into bitter rivalry and deadly warfare, with victory alternating between papal tyranny and imperial despotism. What in theory was a divine order of life became in practice a regime of inhumanity verging on brutality.

With the dissolution of medieval uniformity came modern diversity—nationalism in the state, denominationalism in the church, twins born in the same parentage. The transition from the one to the other was made in two historic movements; the Renaissance, the rediscovery of man, and the Reformation, the rediscovery of God. From the one came humanism and from the other evangelicalism, the direct opposites of the two controlling ideals of medieval life, universal dominion by the group and the renunciation of the world by the individual.

Renaissance and Reformation were all the more irresistible on account of the long-felt inadequacy of the Catholic conception of life to satisfy the human heart. It proved, after centuries of experiment, a "bed shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it; and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it." It satisfied neither the progressive men of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries nor the requirements of the New Testament. Its defect was the fatal disease of one-sidedness, the one-sided emphasis of the divine to the neglect of the human, of the institution to the neglect of the



individual, of authority to the neglect of freedom. Men were the wards of the church and the subjects of the state. Thought and action were prescribed for them. But when the individual awakened to his personal rights and affirmed his ability to know and to do, he could no longer be curbed by prince or prelate.

We shall briefly enumerate the positive forces favoring a new era. The Teutonic tribes gradually became mature nations, each striving for a political and religious order which was not simply its heritage but its creation. Greco-Roman culture, preserved in the Catholic Church, stood for authority and obedience, the exaltation of the institution and the repression of the individual. The Teutonic spirit aspired to freedom and self-realization, the right of reason and of conscience. Teutonism and Catholicism could not permanently dwell under the same roof.

The new nations were stimulated to revolt, also, by the revival of the ancient classics. The writings of Greece and Rome expressed in crystal phrase the spirit that throbbed in Celt and Saxon. What the Greeks once did, the Teutons now desired to do.

The rediscovery of the New Testament and the reëxperience of saving faith, sovereign grace, and the priesthood and brotherhood of believers had in them the dynamic of a new age—an age in which nationalism took the place of cosmopolitanism and denominationalism of Catholicism, the one largely controlled by humanism, the other, relatively at least, by evangelicalism. Both were the result of individualism and personal freedom put in place of institutionalism and imperial authority. Individualism in its reaction against vested authority was held in check in the formation of new states by racial affinities and national traditions. But in the church it ran riot; not content with the state church, men organized dissenting groups within the state and regardless of the state.

The new age bred its own brood of troubles. Its gains were not without losses, or its virtues without vices. Time came

when the ills of nationalism and denominationalism were only little less intolerable than the evils of imperialism and papacy.

Each state became a miniature empire, repudiating the age-long right of the conscience of united Christendom to impose restraints upon its will. Each state refused to recognize a law or court of final appeal, beyond itself, for the adjudication of international difficulties. The original autocracy of the Middle Age was broken into fragments but each fragment became an original autocracy as tyrannical as medieval sovereigns. The outcome was interminable war between the nations until western civilization was on the verge of bankruptcy. Poets and philosophers sang and spoke of a return of the "good old Middle Age," the abolition of nation and sect by the revival of an imperialism and a catholicity of the medieval kind.

New problems, however, cannot be solved by the easy way of the resuscitation of old institutions. The days of civil and religious uniformity, enforced by might, were forever gone. If the essential unity of civilization was to find political expression, it could not be done through the exaltation of a dominating person or race becoming the conscience of mankind and the arbiter of its destiny. Nor could the dearly bought rights of individuals and states ever again be ignored in a new order. Remedy for the cure of political ills must be found in a form of internationalism, differing widely from the homogeneous cosmopolitanism of ancient or medieval times.

Its prophet was Hugo Grotius who proclaimed a law higher than the national will and binding on all nations, Christian or pagan. He appealed to the law of nature of which Sophocles sings in his *Antigone*: "Laws that are not of today or yesterday but abide forever and of their creation knoweth no man." The Peace Palace of the Hague is the temple dedicated to this cause. The League to Enforce Peace is a recent organization for its effective realization. A world, divided into two armies for more than four years, has declared by a

colossal holocaust of men and treasure, that a universal empire, trampling upon the rights of nations and seeking uniformity by the stifling of nationalism, is both a base and a baseless dream, and that a democratic internationalism respecting national rights as inviolate and making room for infinite diversity in the coöperative unity of the race is the goal of evolving humanity.

The churches of the modern age shared the spirit and the fate of the states. They were divided into sects and schisms, each opposed to the other and none recognizing a common law of faith or life binding on all. Each was sufficient unto itself and was the arbiter of its controversies. True, all appealed to the Bible but the Bible had as many different meanings as interpreters. Conflicts between churches were fought out, though never decided, with bitter polemics by ecclesiastical assemblies and by ministers of the gospel. Enemies were met and disposed of by ways foul or fair. The strong had no compunctions about suppressing the weak, if need be, by force. Denominations, like nations, grew in strength by invading one another's domain. The one proselyted, the other conquered. Lord Acton says: "Calvin preached and Bellarmine lectured but Machiavelli ruled."

For the diversity and freedom of Protestantism, men paid the price of sectarian warfare, Catholic against Evangelical, Lutheran against Calvinist, Anglican against Puritan, conformist against dissenter. For deliverance from paralyzing Catholic uniformity, men paid the price of collective action, coöperation, and united effort for the kingdom of God. For freedom from external authority, from the grip of the dead hand, men paid the price of the excesses and follies of private judgment running into autocratic individualism or anarchy. Penance and asceticism were abolished, but in many instances without their evangelical equivalent in Protestant circles.

Notwithstanding the loss incurred in going from medieval catholicity to modern denominationalism, we believe the gain was greater than the loss and that humanity and religion took

a long stride forward through the Reformation and the Renaissance.

But from the beginning the nobler spirits of the age deplored sect and schism in the church as both unprofitable and unchristian. They took steps to retrieve the loss incurred through divisions. The hope of a reunited Protestantism, yea of a reunited Christianity, never died out in Melancthon and Calvin, Bucer and Cranmer, Duraeus and Calixtus, Zinzendorf and Wesley. They in their sphere, like Grotius in his, caught a glimpse of a unity of the churches deeper than their diversity, of the essentials of Christianity in distinction from its doctrinal and institutional forms, of a law higher than the will of denominational judicatories, of a kingdom wider than any church or than all churches. In the light of this vision the spirit of polemics waned and the spirit of irenics grew. Men felt that they might differ in doctrine and yet coöperate for the moral and social betterment of nations. While they differed in creeds, their hymns and prayers were one. It was but natural that men would propose plans to give tangible and organized form to the growing consciousness of Christian unity. There were those in the churches, as they were in the states, who attempted to heal divisions by the restoration of Catholicism, medieval or ancient. But just as the ills of nationalism can not be cured by a return to cosmopolitanism, so the defects of denominationalism cannot be remedied by a restoration of Catholicism. Nothing but a new interdenominationalism, akin to the new internationalism, recognizing both the unity of the spirit of Christianity and the diversity of its forms, conserving the freedom and personal initiative which go with individualism and denominationalism, and yet engendering coöperation in place of competition between the churches and the subordination of denominational welfare to the advancement of the Kingdom of Christ upon earth—this alone will satisfy the demands of the Christian consciousness today.

Various forms of closer relation between the churches have

been tried, including the Evangelical Alliance, the council of churches of the same type, as for example, the Council of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System throughout the World, and the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. Yet none of these is final. There is an irrepressible longing for a still closer union expressed in the proposal for an Ecumenical Conference on Faith and Order, and in the unanimous action of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. inviting the evangelical churches of the United States to a conference on organic union, in response to which we are here today. While statesmen on two continents are devising a new internationalism, churchmen are true to the spirit of the age and of their Lord, when they assemble to consider ways of a new interdenominationalism. For a new relation between nations will inevitably require, in time, a new relation between the churches. Again the two will be twin-born.

The problem before us is how shall the evangelical denominations of America approach the question of organic union? Not by reversion to the doctrines, polity, or cultus of any one of them. Such a plan would provoke the suspicion of an unholy and unwarranted presumption. Not even by the proposal of a form of faith and order, old or new, as a basis for the union of all churches. Such a proposal would be neither biological nor christological. Organic union is unthinkable save as it comes by organic process and not by legislative action. A new organism must evolve, taking into itself the essential Christian elements of the old denominations and eliminating their ephemeral historical forms. Such an evolution requires a new organic principle laying hold of the stuff of the several denominational organisms and uniting them, by transforming them after its own kind, into a new organism, greater than anyone of them or than all of them.

This organic principle, we believe, is the essence of evangelical Christianity, not of course a dogma, a polity, a cultus, or a moral code. It is a spiritual experience born out of a

sense of need—the need of the living God. Not indeed a new need, but an old need felt in a new way in the dawn of a new age. It was felt by prophet and psalmist, by apostle and father, by schoolman and reformer. Each answered it in his own way and in the light of his own day. Whenever a new vision of God satisfies the cry of the awakened heart, there is a marked advance in the history of Christianity and in the religious life of the race.

As in the dawn of a new era in the sixteenth century so in the dawn of a new age in the twentieth, the elemental spiritual needs of men voice themselves in a threefold form: the need of providence, the need of grace, and the need of truth or a way of life.

In the presence of a universe with forces that devastate and destroy and of the evils of the individual and social life, some in the blood, some in the air, God needs to be justified before men as much as men need to be justified before God. The one is the perennial problem of theodicy, the other of soteriology. The Reformers found a solution, not in ancient philosophy, in stoical defiance, in cynical scorn, in epicurean indulgence, or in sceptical negation, but in childlike trust in a Christ-like God who upholds and controls matter and mind in the universe for the ultimate establishment of the reign of holy love. God is justified before men by faith in divine providence.

Men, then as now, came to a new sense of sin and failure, and felt the need of grace the more keenly they felt the guilt of sin. The Reformers were humiliated by personal sin; we in addition, are burdened by sin in its overpowering social and national form. In vain do we seek riddance of sin by the outworn devices of men, by ignoring it, by doing penance for it, by forgetting it. Like the Reformers we can find peace only through forgiveness, in the free grace of God revealed in Christ and appropriated by faith. Men are justified by faith in a Christ-like God.

Men, then as now, felt the need, not only of divine grace



for the sinner, but of a divine life for the saved. In vain did they follow the traditions of the church, the example of prophets and priests, of sages and saints, or of the light of reason and the promptings of conscience. These were mostly blind guides leading the blind. They found their Lord and Master, as well as their Savior, in the God-like man who said: "I am the way, the truth and the life."

The essence of evangelical Christianity, therefore, is a spiritual experience of God in Christ who satisfies the permanent threefold need of the human soul by revealing a God of love who provides, a God of grace who forgives, and a God of truth who guides. When men once have found Christ and direct access to God, they can no longer be humanist or Catholic; not even Episcopalian or Baptist, Reformed or Presbyterian, Congregational or Methodist, Disciple or Quaker, Lutheran or Calvinist. They can be only evangelical Christians.

Denominational names represent groups who, with more or less success, have attempted to embody the evangelical spirit in intellectual and institutional forms. Each of them has only relatively succeeded and so far each has relatively failed.

When we have a deeper and broader experience of the changeless evangelical realities, our ecclesiastical forms and formulas will become inadequate and irksome, and we shall be prepared to lay them aside as garments that are worn out. We shall cease to pronounce denominational shibboleths, and in the irresistible power of a new life born of the Holy Spirit, we shall proclaim, with heart and voice and hand, the evangel of Christ.

When we are thus united by the spirit of God in hope, and faith, and love, then with full confidence in one another and with supreme loyalty to the Christ in us, we shall declare ourselves before the world what we are in fact, the united Church of Christ. Then the Lord's prayer for the unity of the believers will be answered, "that they all may be one; as thou,

Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us."

After a spiritual unity of this kind is once begotten in us then we shall take our time, as did the fathers in ancient councils and modern assemblies, to work out a formula of doctrine, a system of government, a mode of worship, and a way of life, which will be true to the Christ of the New Testament, to the Christ in us, and to the democratic spirit of the age. In the meantime let us work and pray with the vision of the prophets, with the patience of the saints, and with the courage of our Lord.

LANCASTER, PA.

## VII.

### "THE GOSPEL OF JESUS."

WILLIAM F. KOSMAN.

Is the gospel that has been commonly preached in the Christian churches the gospel of Jesus? That is, is it the gospel that Jesus preached?

One need but be intelligently familiar with the historic facts of the ministry of Jesus and at the same time know something of the preaching of the average pulpit during the past and present generations to answer unhesitatingly in the negative.

The reason for this divergence is not far to seek. During the intervening centuries the gospel which Jesus preached has been worked upon by the formulating and dogmatizing processes of the ages, each age elaborating upon the survivals of the age preceding, until the simple message heralded by the lowly Nazarene has become all but lost in the elaborated systems inherited by the churches of to-day. In such a situation it is the task of modern scholarship to reach down through this mass of dogma and creed, this "numerous ancestry," and bring to light again the gospel of Jesus in all its beautiful and saving simplicity.

The result of this effort this paper hopes to reflect with, however, only that degree of accuracy they may reasonably be expected from a busy pastor.

*In the Synoptics.*—Jesus is referred to again and again, in distinction from the teaching and healing activities of his ministry, as preaching the gospel, or "good news," or "good tidings," as the term in the Greek implies.<sup>1</sup> What was this

<sup>1</sup> Mark 1: 15, Matt. 9: 35, Luke 4: 18.

gospel which Jesus preached? This is primarily a question of exegesis. I need not refer to the problems with which exegetical critics must wrestle. How much of the gospel narratives as they have come down to us is historical, how much is legendary? What parts are authentic, what are later additions? To what extent are the sayings and teachings of Jesus really his and to what extent have they been colored by the preconceived ideas and the prevailing concepts of those through whom the earlier traditions were formulated and recorded and those by whom later copied and revised? These are questions that must be seriously considered by one who wishes to arrive at an historically correct conception of the form and content of the gospel preached by Jesus.

Now, almost every synoptic reference to the "good tidings" or gospel which Jesus preached and which he sent forth his disciples to preach, contains the phrase, "the kingdom," or "the kingdom of God." Thus Matt. 4: 23; "Jesus went about in all Galilee preaching the gospel of the kingdom," and Luke 4: 43, "I must preach the good-tidings of the kingdom of God"—and further investigation reveals innumerable references of similar import. There can be no doubt whatever, therefore, that the synoptics portray Jesus as preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God. Thus our question is shifted somewhat and now becomes—"What did Jesus mean by the term the 'kingdom of God,' and what was the 'good news' he proclaimed concerning it?"

Jesus, nowhere, so far as our records go, defined the term "the kingdom of God." This allows us to infer, and rightfully, I think, that he adopted the popular messianic kingdom idea prevailing among the Jews of his day. It was this idea that was his point of contact or connection with their thought and hope. He considered himself in line with the prophets of old. Indeed, he linked his own work directly to that of John the Baptist and began his preaching with John's clarion call (Mark 1: 15) "The kingdom of God is at hand, repent." We have every ground for assuming, then, that at the begin-

ning of his ministry the term "the kingdom of God" meant to Jesus just about what it meant to the Jewish contemporaries.

To determine just what the kingdom idea entailed in the minds of the Jewish people would require more time than is at the writer's disposal. Suffice it to say, that it had different meanings at different periods and for different classes and tended to grow constantly more apocalyptic. But there were in it ever these two constants: (1) The conception of God as the Father of his people, and (2) the coming by direct intervention of God of a social and political order, including the restoration of Israel as a nation of independence and power and the reign of social justice and religious purity—and these must have been present in the kingdom idea of Jesus else his message would not have been intelligible to his hearers. This means, among other things, that the gospel of Jesus as he preached it from the very beginning, aside from the ethics he taught, had in it a distinct social concept—a fact which should never be overlooked. Of course, as Jesus grew in spirit and in mind, as his own vision widened he seriously modified and corrected and spiritualized the popular conception, investing it with such spiritual radiance and beauty that it became a new revelation. The kingdom was to come not only to a people but to each individual soul. It was to come not through divine catastrophe but through organic development; first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn on the ear. It was to be not simply a future hope but also a present reality. It was to be not national and ethnic but personal and social—all modifications of immense importance.<sup>2</sup>

Subjectively, the kingdom proclaimed by Jesus is a relationship, in which love is the law—binding God as the Father to man as the son—a Father-Son relationship into which God is constantly seeking to draw men, forgiving every sinner who humbly and with contrite heart seeks forgive-

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Shailer Matthews, *The Gospel and the Modern Man*, p. 9.

ness and welcoming every self-righteous man who reverses the direction of his life and becomes as a little child.<sup>3</sup> This Father-Son relationship between God and man implies, also a relationship of brotherhood between man and man, since children of a common Father can honor that Father only by living in a brotherly relation. Further, this relationship of love and brotherhood between God and man and between man and man constitutes *the kingdom life*—eternal life, life in quality like that of God, which is the energizing principle and at the same time the goal of the kingdom. This kingdom life, because of its very nature, flows out from the individual toward his fellows, claiming them as his brothers, children of the same Father, and into all the relationships of his life, reconstructing everything it touches, doing the will of God, and thus introducing his kingdom on earth.<sup>4</sup> That this was the kingdom of God—or rather that this kingdom of God was at hand and that all men might enter it—this was the gospel preached by Jesus.

It must not be forgotten, however, that another element enters into the conception of the kingdom of God as proclaimed by Jesus, and that is Jesus himself. As time went on, there developed within Jesus the consciousness that *he himself was incarnating this new life in God in all its moral and spiritual fulness and perfection and that he therefore was the one chosen and empowered of God to establish the kingdom. Thus, hesitatingly at the first, boldly and openly at the last, Jesus proclaimed himself the Messiah, investing the term with new meaning, however, just as he had invested the term "the kingdom" with new meaning. It is only in this light that we can understand some of the self-exalting and authority-claiming statements made by Jesus. By authority of the life he lived he claimed to be the way to a knowledge of the Father and to fellowship with Him—the proclaimer of*

<sup>3</sup> Matt. 18: 1-4.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, p. 48.



the gospel and the embodiment of its life and therefore Jesus can never be dissociated from the gospel he preached. It is through him that the kingdom progresses. As the individual acknowledges his leadership and places himself under the sway of his spiritual kingship he too is brought into vital fellowship with the Father and becomes a partaker of the new life in God which flows from him in turn into the relationship in which his life exists.

To sum up, the gospel preached by Jesus was the "good tidings" that the kingdom of God was at hand and that all men might enter it. The kingdom of God has its existence in a relationship of love between God and men in which prayer is the vital link and in a relationship of brotherliness among men in which goodwill is the controlling motive. In its essence this double relationship is life, the kingdom life, eternal life, the God-life in the soul of man flowing forth into the spheres of human existence. Jesus himself is the proclaimer of this kingdom and the perfect embodiment of its life, the way through whom men come unto the Father.

This essentially and simply is the gospel of Jesus as preached by him and as recorded in the synoptic records.

But the moment one passes from Jesus to the Apostles, from the synoptics to John and Paul, one becomes conscious of a change of atmosphere. That which was secondary or implicit in the preaching of Jesus now becomes prominent.<sup>5</sup> The messianic claims of Jesus are put to the forefront and magnified out of all proportion to the importance Jesus himself attached to them. "Jesus is the Christ, the Lord, the Messiah, long foretold," constitutes the theme of the gospel as is plainly manifest in Peter's sermon on Pentecost. And it may be remarked, in passing, that the early disciples, awaiting the speedy return of Jesus to establish his transcendental kingdom were not interested in the world about them, nor in giving social expression to the life within them, though, of course, the lives they lived could not help acting as a social

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Shailer Matthews, *The Gospel and Modern Man*, p. 12.

leaven. As Dr. McGiffert<sup>6</sup> points out, apologetics had become the imperative need of the hour—not simply the proclamation of the gospel, but the defence of it and of Jesus himself, the preacher of it. They conceived their first duty to be to prove that Jesus was the promised Messiah of the Jewish messianic hope, the resurrection being the supreme proof in support of their argument. Thus the emphasis was transferred from the gospel itself to the evidences of its truth, from the message to the form in which it came, from the preaching of the good news of the kingdom and the kingdom-life to the proclaiming of the messiahship of Jesus.

Somewhat later, when the scene of early Christianity began to be shifted from Palestine to the Græco-Roman world where there existed no historic sympathy for the messianic idea, the original messianic interest among the early Christians began to wane and now the *person* of Jesus is brought more and more to the forefront. It is felt that the founder of such a kingdom must be a unique person and more and more his life becomes invested with divine glory. His birth, his resurrection, his ascension are now miraculous events that prove him a divine Being. He becomes now not the "servant of God" as in the messianic concept, but the "Son of God." Not the message but the messenger; not the work but the person, not the gospel of Jesus but the gospel about Jesus is preached. This emphasis is especially noticed in Paul. It is in the Pauline period, as Pfeiderer points out, that the Jesus of history is theologized into the Christianity of Paul. Around this Christ, this divine Being, Paul proceeds to weave his great drama, the great drama of the heavenly being, who, pre-existing in divine glory (a counterpart of which is the logos doctrine of John), dwelt on this earth for a brief period, died the death on the cross, thus reconciling the sinner to God, rose again and returned to his former though now more glorious abode in heaven (Phil. 2) whence he shall come again to judge the living and the dead.

<sup>6</sup> *Apostolic Age*, p. 54.

That this involved drama is far removed from the simple gospel of Jesus is very evident. Indeed some scholars are so keenly conscious of this difference that Paul seems to them the fountain head of Christianity as it has come down to us from the past, and not Jesus. Paul for them is a new phenomenon. Jesus, they say, gave us the gospel but Paul gave us a new religion—Christianity. Such, for instance, is the essential position of the book *The Brook Cherith* by George Moore, the Irish novelist, a book widely discussed a little while ago. Undoubtedly this is going too far—farther than the facts warrant. Nevertheless, it seems to be clear, that although traces of the idea of the kingdom of God, the fatherly love of God, the divine life in the believer, and other evidences of the survival of the gospel of Jesus do appear in Paul, Paul and Jesus differ decidedly *in the stressed* portions of their respective gospels, and that moreover the stream of historic continuity has come from Paul.

In Paul, the person is emphasized; in Jesus, the message. In Paul, the messianic drama; in Jesus, the gospel of the kingdom. In Paul, we have an elaborated system; in Jesus, we have a simple, unphilosophical, joyously creative religious message. In Paul, the call to men to believe in the incarnation, death, resurrection of Jesus as a Divine Being. In Jesus, the call to men to submit their souls to God and his will. Of course, this development was perfectly in accord with the development of thought and life and we have no quarrel with Paul. A theology is the inevitable and necessary concomitant of religious faith. In all this, as Shailer Matthew points out,<sup>7</sup> Paul was but correlating religion with his own experience and elaborating and adjusting the message of Jesus to the needs of his age as the exigencies of its thought demanded and in terms his age could understand. Indeed it is a question open to serious doubt whether Christianity in any other form than that in which it was cast by Paul could have made any progress beyond the narrow confines of Palestine.

<sup>7</sup> *Gospel and the Modern Man*, p. 20.

Now, after Paul, and with Paul as a point of departure, this process of deifying the person of Jesus, systematizing the gospel, and making of the simple message of "good news" an involved theology—continued with unabated vigor.

From the time of Constantine, when Christianity became organized and aligned itself with the world-power of Rome, the dogmatizers—the Greek with his love of metaphysics and the Roman with his passion for system—added to the structure reared by Paul until the resplendently human Jesus who walked the hills of Judea proclaiming the kingdom of God was all but lost in the meshes of the elaborated system of dogma and doctrine of the middle ages,—a system which, while it revealed an intellectual acumen that remains one of the marvels of the world to this day, could have been but a handicap to the growth of the fine and simple religion of Jesus, which survived in spite of it.

Many of these dogmatizers were influenced by the current ideas of the state which shaped their theological concepts very largely. Augustine, the prince of theological system builders, borrowed his ruling ideas from Roman Imperialism, and one of the remarkable phenomena of history is the fact that Augustine's Imperialistic Deity has sat upon the throne of Christian Theology and wielded its autocratic sway from that time to this. Deliverance seems at hand, however. Humanity's great onslaught against the Kaiser and Kaiserism everywhere bids fair to compel even Augustine's Deity to step from the throne and make room for that Democratic God who only will be worshipped by men in a democratic world.

Moreover, Luther and Calvin, in their efforts to purify Christianity, it has now become clear, went back not to Jesus but to Augustine and Paul. So far from smashing the Roman system of thought, they left it essentially intact. Indeed, the respected Reformers and their successors wrought out a formidable system of their own. Paul's drama is revised and amplified. God, the stern autocratic deity enthroned in the heavens far above the earth, demands moral perfection, or in

the words of the Heidelberg Catechism, demands that man "keep the law of God perfectly." Man being totally depraved, "prone to all evil and backward to all good" cannot keep the law thus perfectly and in consequence, the wrath of God is evoked against him and he is doomed to eternal damnation. However, God does not leave man utterly to perish but provides a substitute to bear the pain and penalty of his sin for him. This substitute is his only begotten son, who being co-existent and co-equal with the Father comes down to earth, assumes the form of man and, being thus both human and divine, makes complete satisfaction and appeases the wrath of God by his death on the cross—or, by giving himself a ransom on the cross, purchases man's release from the power of satan to which in consequence of his sin he had become committed. If man by faith lays hold upon the atoning work of this Redeemer, the righteousness of Christ is imputed to him, and he is saved, entering at death into his eternal reward in heaven. If he refuses, his portion will be eternal punishment inflicted also at death or at the day of judgment. This, though somewhat badly stated, is the gospel of evangelical Christianity as it has come down to us and as it has been preached in every orthodox pulpit in the land.

Now, of this gospel it can be said that it has produced some splendid types of men and women. A drama of salvation that has given to millions of hearts the best they have and that has lent the most impressive expression to the ethical thought of divine love and grace is to be treated, to say the least, with respect, and it cannot be denied that this and other historic forms of the gospel, however far afield they wandered in both form and content from the original preaching of Jesus, have been of tremendous significance in making the Christian religion real. Above all else, Christianity is a new *life* and this new life will clothe itself in the terminology and thought forms of each succeeding age. This is why the gospel has functioned in every age. We dare not come to a discussion like this lacking historical sympathy. Nevertheless, he must

be blind indeed, with the blindness of him who will not see, who does not realize that the time has come when a re-statement, a new interpretation and a modern application of the gospel of Jesus is absolutely imperative. The spirit and consciousness of our age differ so widely from that of preceding ages that what met their needs will no longer meet ours. We must do for our age what the fathers did for theirs. If the gospel is to be a dynamic *in our age*, then it must be cast into a form and expressed in terms that are intelligible to the men and women of the present day.

The only question is this—in doing this where shall we begin? Shall we begin with the Reformers, with Augustine, with Paul, or shall we begin with Jesus? Shall we endeavor to *recast* this body of doctrine that has come down to us? Shall we try to *revise* this survival of ecumenical theology, Greek philosophy, Roman law, and Medieval politics? Or shall we in our own day *de novo* interpret and apply the gospel of Jesus in language and thought forms of our own to the problems that are peculiar to the complex life of our age?

The modern man declares unhesitatingly for the latter procedure. He prefers to go back to Jesus—or rather, to bring Jesus back to him. With his sense of historical development, he distinguishes between the original form and content of the gospel as preached by Jesus and the form of content of the gospel as it has become colored by the preconceived ideas and the controlling concepts of each succeeding age, and reaches through the latter to the former. It is the gospel of Jesus in its original simplicity that meets his needs and satisfies the longing of his heart. He would hold fast to the great redeeming and saving truths that have made the religion of Jesus vital in every generation in the past but he would re-evaluate them in the light of his own day and re-apply them in terms in keeping with the peculiar consciousness of the age in which he lives.

Thus he begins with Jesus.

Without breaking with the continuity of faith and devotion



manifested by the saints gone before, he would open the pages of the historic records anew and allow Jesus of Nazareth, stripped of all the ecclesiastical and theological garb and contrivances with which the centuries have clothed him, to step forth in the beauty and power of his perfect humanity and speak directly to this age his glorious "good news" of the coming of the kingdom of God on earth, the kingdom in which God is the Father and men are brothers—the kingdom by entrance into which man finds deliverance from individual and social sins. He would lay hold directly upon the kingdom—life which Jesus exemplified so perfectly and which he imparts to those who follow him—the kingdom-life which, with all its social implications, meets the inmost needs of the modern man's life.

The language which Jesus speaks is a language the modern man can understand. His are the ideals that strike a responsive cord in his socially-awakening consciousness. His is a program he can pray for, work for, and die for.

ALTOONA, PA.

## VIII.

### SOME EFFECTS OF THE WAR ON SOCIAL CONDITIONS.

E. L. COBLENTZ.

To assume to see or know all the possible social consequences of the late war would be sheer arrogance. To attempt to express with any degree of thoroughness what is actually seen would be impossible within the appropriate limits of time of this occasion; therefore, we shall indicate some of the big massive and more prominent effects.

#### I. THE ACTUAL LOSS TO THE WORLD OF THE SLAIN.

Whatever may be the proportion of the number of men killed in battle, dying from wounds and hardship, to the total number engaged, yet the actual death of ten millions of men, with ten million others wounded and handicapped for life, makes an inroad upon the man power of the world in purely labor and productive units that must have far reaching industrial effects. Reconstructive agencies, however expensive and magnificent, can not restore these men. Gold stars can not be turned again to blue and sections of France, Belgium, Germany, Austria, England and America will be deprived of considerable portions of their capable working and operative force.

These men were not simply workers. They were sons and husbands. The world will not only be deprived of their labor and ability commercially, but their families will be deprived of their love, care, comfort, guidance and inspiration, which may result not only in the loss of a fair chance to live but in that greater loss, the loss of a real interest in life and a desire to live. "If the hearts that bleed could sleep with the slain,

if the grave could bury its grief, but no, death will not have it so." Multiply the poignant pain we have felt in our lives caused by the death of one near to us ten millionfold and we get some estimate of the magnitude of the burden of sorrow upon the heart of the world and some sense of the loss in love and comfort the race has sustained through the death of those fallen in this war. Then too we can not forget that most of these were young men whose lives were largely yet before them. In the great acres of the dead what power, what ideals, what purposes, what possibilities lie buried. If Grey in his *Elegy* could say over the mounds in a country churchyard, "Some mute inglorious Milton here may lie, Some Cromwell guiltless of his country's blood, Hands that the rod of empire might have swayed, Or waked to ecstasy the living lyre," could it not with greater emphasis and propriety be chanted over Flanders field?

## II. THE FINANCIAL BURDEN.

When we turn from the possible industrial and domestic effects of the loss of fully fifty millions of men, women and children, to the destruction of property, the damage and loss to shipping, the prodigious expenditures of public and private moneys for ammunition, equipment of instruments of destruction and engines of death—billions piled on billions, and realize that these vast sums are not paid but bound, like a huge millstone upon the neck of humanity, and consider, that millions of people will be deprived of a chance for education, hours for leisure and health and culture, and that the faces of now unborn generations will be pinched, their backs bent and their bodies and souls too perhaps dwarfed ere this burden of debt is rolled away, when we add to this the settled hate and intrigue and schemes of dishonesty that go with such things, are we not staggered, does not the imagination falter and fail before the possible depressing effects of this war. Is it not a stupendous calamity. Well could Mr. Beecher in his lecture call war one of the great wastes and burdens of society.

## III. MORAL AND RELIGIOUS CONSEQUENCES.

War is a return to those primal instincts of force and power, of fight and destruction, to secure some advantage and to gain some supremacy over an adversary. It marks the downfall of the reign of reason and the advent of the reign of terror. The moral effect of war upon the men actually engaged in it is like the moral effect of any other united enterprise that appeals to these primal powers of force. It begets a certain ferocity. It awakens slumbering heroism. It encourages deeds of daring. It makes men greet death with a cheer. It is a bloody altar whereon some men's sins seem to be washed away, or the altar stairs their souls climb through darkness up to God. Temporarily at least it obliterates racial and social distinctions and breaks down artificial barriers.

War however, in spite of all, is not glorious. Men are glorious, War is not. As well talk about a fever being glorious because it arouses the nerves of the patient and makes the mother hover with such tenderness and watch with such patience. No, war is not glorious. The moral effect may depend upon the kind of reactions men set up toward it, but from its very nature one moral effect must be a recrudescence, a sort of reversion toward brutality. What man can wriggle his bayonet into another man against whom he has no ill will personally, only in that corporate way that he is one of the enemy, without in some way being a different man. Can any nation drill and train itself to a fine degree of nicety, for deceit, strategy and slaughter, on the principle that the end justifies the means without blurring its moral sense and hardening its soul. To resist what should be resisted is noble. To submit to what should be fought out is worse than war. The nation that will not fight for its soul has no soul worth fighting for, but the nation that fights runs the risk also of losing its soul, whether it be victor or vanquished.

The byproducts of war are of two kinds, one glorious and the other inglorious. It is not what does war do to us, but

what do we do with war? The fine spirit of coöperative activities of sacrifice not only by soldiers but civilians at home is magnificent. But the moral life around some camp communities, the exaggerated if not perverted statements about the enemy on both sides, the swearing on public platforms applauded as patriotism, the compulsory suppression of freedom of speech, the coercion of thought into the support of partisan purposes rather than encouraging it into realms of truth, the willingness to do this for the sake of seeming to be more loyal, and more patriotic and thus of securing public approval and patronage, the various schemes for profiteering and the capitalizing of patriotism will leave a moral shade over the face of the public conscience.

When swearing and vulgarity and perversion of facts become glorified by the badge or sanctified by being baptized as patriotism then moral degeneration has already taken place. The very means used to defeat a mad rampant autocracy will arouse suspicion in the mind of the thoughtful, whether our Democracy as it now is, is entirely adequate to the actual needs of society and thoroughly safe for the world.

When we think in terms of religion, we accept with profound joy of soul the statements of chaplains and Y. M. C. A. secretaries and the personal testimonies of individuals from the trenches, how the great realities of life came up in grandeur and around and above and through it all, they saw and heard God. This must have a remarkable effect. It will likely make much of the conventional church machinery seem useless if not almost idle and silly. It will especially in Europe batter down or cause to be ignored many of the ecclesiastical distinctions. When a Jewish Rabbi completes the unfinished prayer of a protestant chaplain, shot while ministering to the dying and a protestant chaplain holds to the lips of a dying soldier the crucifix just fallen from the dead hands of a Roman priest, then not only men but sectarianism has been shot to pieces and God has been glorified.

But with all reverence for all this we must remember this was on the field of battle. I can not share with some of my brethren the complacent belief that these war experiences will have a marvelous inevitable, almost fatalistic regenerative effect upon vital religion and church life. How many of the stars on service flags represent names from whom can rightly be expected some great spiritual, religious or church regeneration. Let their experiences be even greater than expressed, yet were not our experiences of God, of the saving power of Jesus and his boundless redemptive love gained years before the war and not in war atmosphere. Much of the talk today makes one think that a man would have to kill others in battle before he could have a real and wonderful experience of God or a gospel message to preach. The arguments today seem to force the conclusion that Jesus should have led the Zealot Army against Cæsar and killed Romans in order to have known his Father and acquired a vigorous life-giving gospel.

Doubtless in the face of the world's needs the whole subject of church unity, of a unified or federated Christendom will receive new impulse and perhaps some aid from returned soldiers and chaplains, but the possible beneficial effect upon real religion from this source has in the writer's humble judgment been wonderfully overestimated and some enthusiasts are heading toward an awakening from a beautiful delusion by way of a shock that we trust will be sobering.

The great effect of the war for religion is the sudden awareness it produced upon the world of how little after all society was pervaded and dominated by the religious and ethical standards of Jesus, of how useless and unreal much that was called religion really was, and how unqualifiedly true and essential Jesus' basis and standard of life, of fellowship and fairness is for any permanent social structure. This many men saw long ago. The world war has forced some others to see it. What they will do now is not clear. It would be interesting to conjecture.



#### IV. POLITICAL REINTERPRETATION AND READJUSTMENT.

In the realm of politics the war will compel both a readjustment of political forces, and a reinterpretation of political principles and ideals.

Nationalism as the maximum unit of organization and final challenge of patriotism is gone forever. It was a rabid nationalism bent upon universal imperialistic sway that forced a combination of other nations to stay its ambitions. By force of circumstances we are in European politics. We can no longer be merely Columbia gem of the ocean lying three thousand miles away in beautiful isolation and serene indifference. We have entered deeply European, Asiatic and world politics, and now have a large share of responsibility for the peace, wellbeing and development of the peoples of the world toward free institutions. Whatever form it may take or problems it may involve, internationalism of some sort is inevitable. This will not mean the cessation but the glorification of nationalism. Internationalism is not a substitute for but a complement of nationalism. Higher loyalties do not destroy but fulfill lesser loyalties. Edith Cavell said, "Patriotism is not enough." A patriotism that is not humanitarian is diabolical. The final unit of the old political order was the armed nation; of the new, friendly humanity. Not nationalism or internationalism but nationalism *and* internationalism one and inseparable now and forever.

The organic form which this will likely take is the League of Nations. This may mean anything all the way from a simple tribunal before which disputes and justiciable cases between nations may be presented as advocated by ex-president Taft, up to a constituted Congress or United States of the world of duly elected representatives, from each nation with well defined judicial and executive authority. Such a League of Nations, like all patent medicines is labelled and presented and accepted too by the populace as a panacea for national ills and a sure cure for war. It is called war's final destroyer.

That such a league will give a chance for nations to present their cases before an international jury, and thus tend toward mutual understanding and to forestall precipitate hostilities is undoubtedly sure, therefore the forming of such a league is a motion in the right direction. But that it is a guarantee against future wars and an assurance of perpetual peace is an unwarranted assumption or conclusion.

War has been the habit of humanity for the ages. This war has not broken the habit, but reinforced it. War has again been glorified. For years to come the deeds of daring, thrilling adventures and hairbreadth escapes will be rehearsed at firesides and proclaimed on patriotic occasions. The presence of returned soldiers, of relics and instruments and trophies of war will arouse the martial instinct. A debauch may make a drunkard sick enough to sign the pledge, but after the headache is over, the sight of the grog shop will lead him to his cups. Macbeth said to the dagger, "Oh weapon thou marshall'st me on." The presence of the weapons of war everywhere now is not conducive to breaking the habit. Can a league of nations break this age long habit?

We have been saying also that autocracy is one cause of war. Is there any assurance that a League of Nations will not be a league of autocrats, for we must remember that autocracy is not a form of government but a spirit of government, and this spirit can exist in democracies as well as in monarchies. Even if all the nations in the league become democracies that is no assurance they will not fight. Republics as well as monarchies fight when there is a clash of material interests.

A league of nations would have to use force of arms to coerce a recalcitrant nation to obey its decisions or bring it back into fellowship and that would mean war especially if that recalcitrant nation was a large one with a dozen or more smaller ones under its wing where they had gathered for protection or hopes of reward.

<sup>1</sup> See "Arms and Men: A Study in Habit." *Hibbert Journal* for October 1918, by L. P. Jacks.

War is a product of a wrong spirit. Deviltry can not be cured by diplomacy, no matter how shrewd the diplomats. Temporarily the world may be made more comfortable and tolerable by spraying it with diplomatic rose water, and manuring its claws with peace tools, and driving it into other kennels, but it can only be cured by changing its habit of thought and attitude and purpose. No alliance can be holier than the allies that compose it. If future diplomacy is to mean, as it did often in the past, a cunning crafty man sent from one country to another to lie about his own country, if the old philosophy of the impracticability of the moral ideals of Jesus in social, national and international relations is still to prevail, then we have only swapped enemies, not subdued them. Germany may be beaten forever, but the spirit which produces war is not, and no formal league of nations, possessed of that spirit can save the world from a repetition of this catastrophe. Let the league come. Let us help its coming, but as ministers and leaders let us know its limitations and also be aware of the real springs of life whence the healing streams do flow.

#### V. ECONOMICS.

This war in all its magnitude was but an incident in and largely a product of a larger war which existed long before this one began and will continue long years after the peace treaty is signed—viz., the economic war, the struggle for a living, then for an income large enough to get out of the common lot, then for wealth, and the consequent clash in this struggle.

The discoveries of natural science, the advent of machines made men masters of natural forces and put the whole realm of natural resources at man's disposal. To secure these, individuals and nations were determined to trade, to invest, to gain, to get control of natural trade routes, and general highways by land and sea necessary for profit, success and supremacy. All nations were anxious for trade with, and investment in the East. Germany tried to build the Bagdad Railroad.

England and Russia, to prevent the disturbance of the balance of power threatened by German ascendancy, agreed to finance Persia. Politics became a shrewd manipulation of tariff schedules and import laws to secure trade and commercial advantage and large returns on invested capital. All nations were in the game of get.

Within the nations, machinery, instead of liberating, enslaved the workers. Society became divided into two classes, the tool owners and the tool users—Capital and Labor. Since the possessing class is always the ruling class whether in a monarchy or democracy, governmental activities were largely a financial manipulation by financiers for financial advantages. This war was partly at least a clash of interests between powers for trade and industrial supremacy. Violent war is an explosion in the social world of the greater war constantly waged in peace.

Mr. Wilson's phrase, "making the world safe for democracy," by its idealism lifted the whole struggle up out of pure materialism, aggrandizement and self defense. To follow this coalition, this unholy alliance between high finance and high politics in its subtle efforts for trade routes and commercial advantage for the last half of a century, is to see the broadcast sowing of the dragon's teeth which of necessity bore fruit in international anarchy.

People whether individuals or nations were only opportunities to be utilized, ground up and coined into dividends often on only watered stock, and politics was the legalized method of procedure.

In one way the war has reinforced this very spirit. Notwithstanding all our generosity and fine sacrifices, the very rapidity with which millions have been made, has put a premium upon the hopes of government assistance to rapid wealth. Then too the presence of Bolshevism, the uprising of the proletariat, which is that lawless reaction of the masses in resistance to the long injustice from entrenched tyranny, compels all lovers of democracy to groan in spirit.

We must resist this lawlessness, this attempt not at leadership but at the lordship of the mob. In doing this entrenched autocracy and plutocracy is again likely to be more deeply entrenched. Autocracy robs by self constructed legal procedure. Bolshevism robs by self consented lawless power; and liberty and righteousness and democracy gasp for their breath and labor for their lives.

On the other hand the war has hastened the social process of industrial democracy by a quarter of a century. The very fact that we could not depend upon rival competing and individually controlled public utilities as public servants to meet the high requirements of our social needs during the war, has exposed this whole system to serious discredit.

The statement by the President in his recent message to Congress is quite indicative of the spirit of the age. He said, "We have three possible courses open before us: (1) return to an exaggerated ante-bellum individualism, (2) go to extreme Marxian Socialism, (3) governmental or public direction and supervision of public utilities." The Hohenzollerns of high finance will prefer the first. The Bolshevik reds will prefer the second, the real lovers of liberty and democracy—and this includes some of the finest statesmen and financiers—will insist on the third. Political democracy without industrial democracy is only a name. A democracy that is safe for the world will include industrial democracy. We are heading that way. The war has hastened the advance. We may not know exactly where we are going, like Abraham, but we do know if we do not go somewhere we will go to the devil here. Just as imperialistic individual nationalism set the world on fire, so capitalistic individual industrialism, its twin brother, will burn it up. Perhaps the direction as well as the rate of the social movement in this direction can not be better expressed than in the following resolution formulated by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and adopted at the industrial Congress in Atlantic City the first week in December, 1918.

# INDUSTRIAL CREED.

"That labor and capital are partners, not enemies, and have common interests.

"That the purpose of industry is not merely material well-being but social well-being, to be attained through the pursuit of four aims—just compensation for capital, adequate recognition for management, good working and living conditions for labor and service to the community.

"That industry, no less than society, has a responsibility in giving to every man opportunity to earn a living at fair wages under decent conditions, with a comfortable home and the chance to develop his life as well as to toil.

"That industry, efficiency and initiative should be rewarded, and indolence, indifference and restriction of production dis-countenanced.

"That adequate means of uncovering and adjusting grievances be provided.

"That the system of representation be built from the bottom up—from plants to districts in the same corporation, then to all units of each industry, then to sectional, national and international groups.

"That attitude is more important than forms, and that the vital force should be a spirit of fair play, justice and brotherhood animating all elements.

"That 'that man renders the greatest social service who so coöperates in the organization of industry as to afford to the largest number of men the greatest opportunity for self-development and the enjoyment by every man of those benefits which his own work adds to the wealth of civilization.'"

When we compare this with the autocratic statement of a great money baron, "The public be damned," we marvel at the long distance and great gulf fixed between these two spirits in a very few years.

It is not a question of wages and hours and concessions from imperialists, not a choice between deciding for master or for



man, but the overthrow of the master-and-man spirit, and the substitution of the servant-and-man spirit, and the inculcation of Jesus' sense of the relative value of things in comparison with the supreme value of personality that is the hope of the new day. This spirit is streaking the dawn. Lift up your heads, oh ye gates, and the King of Glory shall come in. Not only to see him come, but to participate in his coming is the supreme privilege of living today.

CARLISLE, PA.

## IX.

### THE PIETIST ZINZENDORF.

JOHN C. GEKELER.

The study of biography is at once a most interesting and profitable way of studying history, since it deals with the maker and product thereof. Men are both the product and shapers of events. Each man is the child of his age, in so far as he has responded, either consciously or unconsciously, to its influences; and each man who has exerted a moulding influence upon his age may be called a parent thereof. Of Count Nicholas Louis von Zinzendorf this is preëminently true. He is a pattern of a man inspired by deep love for the kingdom of God, willing to give himself unsparingly for its advancement. A man of large vision and sympathy, he was not contented merely to dream dreams, but must needs endeavor to bring them to pass.

Born May 26, 1700, in Dresden, where his father, who died a few weeks after his son's birth, was employed at the Saxon court, his life fell in an age of great political disturbance. There was war and preparation for war somewhere in Europe during the entire sixty years of his life. The war of the Spanish Succession was begun before his birth by Emperor Leopold I., continued under Joseph, and concluded under Charles VI. by the Treaty of Utrecht, March 31, 1714. Upon the death of Augustus II., king of Poland, there ensued war between Austria and Poland, ending at the Peace of Vienna in November, 1735. The war of the Austrian Succession, which broke out upon the death of Charles VI., the last male of the Austrian Hapsburg, after eight years left his daughter Marie Theresa in power at the Treaty of Aix-la-

Chapelle in 1748. The Seven Years' War between France, Austria and Russia on one side, and Prussia under Frederick the Great on the other, lasted from 1756 until 1763.

Nor had Europe yet fully recovered from the evil effects of the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648). Upon the religious life of the century following, this war had wide-reaching influence and is of importance in the understanding of the period under review. The war had been brought about by reactionary forces which attempted to throttle any change on the part of the people in the management of their affairs civil and religious. Practically it was a determined effort to destroy Protestantism. It started with the Bohemian Revolt, which was an effort to establish a Protestant government with the Elector Frederick of the Palatinate as king. Frederick, while possessed of strong religious convictions and of a noble personal character, lacked political acumen and the power of organization, and consequently failed to inspire among his followers a spirit of loyalty, and to secure among the Protestant princes that spirit of coöperation and devotion to a single purpose which would enable them to overcome their petty jealousies. The battle of White Hill near Prague in November, 1620, saw the defeat of the Protestant army by Tilly. This defeat meant the practical collapse of the revolution and the crushing of the Protestant religion in Bohemia. The Bohemian Brethren, under which term the followers of John Huss had survived, were banished from the country, although the Lutherans were tolerated for a while longer. The struggle was between the Catholic Emperor and the provinces which through the adoption of Protestantism had tasted in some small degree the right of self determination. The rule of the Emperor and his generals meant the rule of the priest. The problem involved the unity of the German empire, but, as the Emperor Ferdinand understood that, unity meant the destruction of Protestantism.

The Treaty of Westphalia by which the war was terminated was a compromise the terms of which were difficult of enforcement and were often disregarded. Sutherland Menzies (Mrs.

Elizabeth Stone), "History of Germany," p. 245, characterizes this treaty as follows: "This pacification known as the Pact of Westphalia . . . will be memorable through all time, both from its having served as the foundation of the international law of Europe, of the policy generally adopted by each state, and from its having correctly defined the claims of Protestants and Roman Catholics, the bounds of the imperial, the electoral, the aristocratical, and the municipal powers. It is, in the strictest sense, the key of modern history." The religious question was disposed of as follows:<sup>1</sup> "The religious difficulty in Germany was settled as it ought to have been settled long before. Calvinism was to be placed on the same footing as Lutheranism. New Year's Day, 1624, was fixed upon as the date by which all disputes were to be tested. Whatever ecclesiastical benefice was in Catholic hands at that date was to remain in Catholic hands forever. Ecclesiastical benefices in Protestant hands at that date were to remain in Protestant hands. Catholics would never again be able to lay claim to the bishoprics of the north. Even Halberstadt, which had been retained at the Peace of Prague, was now lost to them. To make this settlement permanent, the Imperial Court was reconstructed. Protestants and Catholics were to be members of the Court in equal numbers. And if the judicial body was such as to make it certain that its sanction would never be given to an infringement of the peace, the Catholic majority in the Diet became powerless for evil." Under this pact the south of Germany became Catholic, as did also Bohemia and Austria. The geographical relation of the two faiths remains practically the same today as it was then settled. "That which gives to the Peace of Westphalia its prominent place amongst treaties is that it drew a final demarcation between the two religions which divided Europe. The struggle in England and France for the right of settling their own religious affairs without the interference of foreign nations had been brought to a close in the sixteenth century. In Germany it had not

<sup>1</sup> Gardiner, *Thirty Years' War*, p. 213 f.

been brought to a close for the simple reason that it was not decided how far Germany was a nation at all. . . . Thirty years of war ended by a compromise under which the religious position of each territory was fixed by the interference of foreign powers, whilst the rights of the central government were entirely ignored.”<sup>2</sup>

Central Europe, which formed the battle ground during these dreary years, was devastated by the armies of friend and foe alike as they lived off the country through which they passed. The condition of the poor people was frightful in the extreme. War was followed by those twin scourges, famine and pestilence. The following description from Menzies' *History of Germany*, p. 248 f., sets forth the awful condition. “Frightful famine was added to the other horrors of war. So ghastly was this visitation that men, to save their lives, disinterred and devoured the bodies of their fellow-creatures, and even hunted down human beings that they might feed on their flesh. The effect of the unnatural and loathsome diet was a pestilence, which swept away the soldiery as well as the people by the thousands. In Pomerania, hundreds destroyed themselves, as unable to endure the pangs of hunger. On the island of Rugen many poor creatures were found dead with their mouths full of grass, and in some districts attempts were made to knead the earth into bread. Throughout Germany the license of war and the misery consequent on famine and pestilence had so utterly destroyed the morality which was once the pride and boast of this land, that the people, a few years before the most simple and kindhearted in Europe, now vied with the foreign mercenaries who infested their country in setting at nought the laws of God as well as man.” From such deadening influences Europe was slow in recovering, and in Zinzendorf's day had not yet outgrown them.

Another sinister influence of that day, and from which the world has not even today been entirely liberated, was the rising house of Brandenburg, or, as it is better known at

<sup>2</sup> Gardiner, *supra*, 215 f.

present, the house of Hohenzollern. The year following that of Zinzendorf's birth witnessed the elevation of Frederick the elector of Brandenburg to the kingship of Prussia by the permission of Emperor Leopold I., "the most unprincipled sovereign that ever cursed a country."<sup>3</sup> When Zinzendorf was thirteen years old Frederick William I. came to the throne. He has been described as a "coarse, uncultivated boor, with passionate temper and a touch of insanity."<sup>4</sup> Unlike his father, who was satisfied with what renown pompous ceremonial might give his reign, Frederick William cherished military ambitions. In order to satisfy these a Spartan frugality was practiced in his family as well as in the state. The money thus obtained was spent upon the military establishment. The army was enlarged by a system of so-called enlistments which in reality was conscription. The enlistments were often secured by deception: "they were in too many cases kidnapped by devices which made the Prussian recruiting sergeant a byword in Europe."<sup>5</sup> In 1740 the aggressive, unscrupulous Frederick the Great followed his father upon the Prussian throne, and carried his policy of force to even further limits at the expense of neighboring states.

Intellectually the period of Zinzendorf was marked by the teaching of the Anglo-French deists whose influence was an introduction to atheism. The witty Voltaire was the leading literary man of France and the continent. A favorite with Frederick the Great, his influence was widely felt upon the intellectual life of the day. With his keen wit he never failed to ridicule the church and religion. In an age when reliance was placed upon brute force, it is not altogether strange that there should be an exaltation of the human reason and a slighting of the claims of true religion. Rationalism was dominant and felt itself in no need of revelation. The religious life was consequently marked by a dead formalism.

<sup>3</sup> Menzies.

<sup>4</sup> Langman, *Frederick the Great*, p. 16.

<sup>5</sup> Langman, p. 17.



In such an atmosphere theological controversy was acrimonious. Interest in the conversion of the heathen which once characterized the Christian Church languished and became an almost unknown quality. The glorious conception of the kingdom of God as taught by the Master Jesus Christ, and which has inspired the noblest thought and effort in our own day had been to a very large degree forgotten and passed by in the zeal for debate. The state controlled the churches. The question of religion which had proved such a bitter disturbance during the Thirty Years' War had not been disposed of on the broad plane of religious charity, and continued to be more or less of a disturbing factor in the civil relations of the day.

Reacting against these religious influences which set formularies and doctrine above practical religion, there arose an opposite tendency of disregarding doctrine and of stressing the practical and emotional side of Christianity. Such a movement prevented, indeed, a one-sided development of Protestantism, but was itself one-sided. There will be found within it, however, the seeds of much present-day church activities which have proved so efficient in maintaining a high type of Christian life. Sohm in *Outlines of Church History* gives the following description of the movement: "This movement, which is now known by the name of Pietism, began in the Reformed Church. In the Church of Holland (at the first under the leadership of Labadie, somewhere about the year 1660), then in other territory of the Reformed Church, was formed the sect of "The Regenerate," which was indifferent to questions of dogma as such, and strove after practical Christianity manifested in an ascetic life, and in a mystic devotion to the bridegroom, Christ. In this the dogmatism of reformed Puritanism was abandoned, and a new expression given to the characteristic endeavor of the Reformed Church to realize the Christian ideal of life. Yet in this movement it was the Lutheran Church that triumphed. This was the meaning of the essentially Lutheran pietism of Spener and Franke, which

arose in opposition to dogmatism at the end of the seventeenth century. Spener united in himself the influence of the reformed tendency to a vigorous and almost ascetic Christian life (he lived some time in Geneva when a student), and the Lutheran tendency to the purely scriptural doctrine of the Bible. . . . Spener was the leader of the movement; and he crowned its victory when, in his *Pia Desideria* (1675), he advocated with impressive earnestness the institution of private meetings for the common study of the Bible, the participation of the laity in the affairs of the Church, and the realization of Christian faith in a life of love: when, above all, in his religious and biblical studies (published 1670), he made a way for a method of scriptural interpretation which treated the Bible, not as a source of scholastic controversies, but as a power of life unto life. Once more the first place was given to the Bible above the Confession of the Church. The demand for regeneration through faith sounded through the Protestant world like a mighty trumpet-call" (p. 192).

Zinzendorf's parents before him had come under the influence of the new movement of pietism, and Spener himself had stood sponsor at the baptism of the child. Following the death of his father a few weeks after the child's birth, the mother of Zinzendorf returned to her ancestral home, and later upon her second marriage placed the young child under the care of his grandmother, the Countess Henrietta Gersdorf, in whose home pietistic influences were continued to be thrown about him. At the early age of ten years he was sent to the famous school of Franke at Halle. Here at the *Pädagogium* when only fifteen years old he covenanted with several schoolmates "to confess Christ and seek the conversion of all sorts and conditions of men."<sup>6</sup> Destined by his family for a career in law and diplomacy, he was sent in 1716 to the University of Wittenberg to begin the study of law. He however preferred theology to law and spent what spare time he could in his favorite studies.

<sup>6</sup> *Am. Ch. Hist.*, Vol. VIII., p. 434.

The purchase from his grandmother of the estate in Upper Lusatia—"the domain of Berthelsdorf"—in 1722 was a step which proved of value to the kingdom of God, and was epochal in his life, since it was upon these estates he carried on the labors which led to the organization of the Moravian Church. He had hoped to settle down upon his property, giving himself to the employment of a landed proprietor devoting himself to the material and spiritual interests of the people. At about the time of the transfer of the property, the clergyman connected with the parish died. To fill the vacancy Zinzendorf appointed John Andrew Rothe, who is described as "an able and zealous candidate for orders." Through Rothe Zinzendorf's attention was directed to the persecuted Bohemian Brethren, to whom he offered a refuge upon his estate. Out in the wilderness a settlement was built which they named Herrnhut. Two years later, together with certain friends, Zinzendorf laid the foundation of what they hoped should become a college for young noblemen to be conducted on the plan of Franke's school at Halle. From five young men, Moravians, who reached Herrnhut on the day of the cornerstone laying of the young college, Zinzendorf learned about the *Unitas Fratrum*, as the organization of the Bohemian Moravians was called.

The little colony grew by additions from Bohemia and Germany through the attraction of the asylum afforded and the fervent preaching of Rothe. But as the colony grew with the addition of persecuted men and women with their peculiar doctrinal beliefs, there arose dispute and strife among them. In order to assist the refugees and to correct just such conditions as had arisen, Zinzendorf resigned the position he held at the Saxon court in 1727. His powers of organization and his sense of orderliness found employment among them. "Certain statutes were formulated, based upon the constitution and discipline of the Brethren, as handed down by tradition in the families of the refugee Moravians."<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> *Am. Ch. Hist.*, Vol. VIII., p. 437.

The missionary enthusiasm of Zinzendorf and the Moravians was kindled in 1731 as a result of his meeting in Copenhagen, whither he had gone to attend the coronation of Christian VI., with two Eskimos who had been converted under the missionary labors of Hans Egede. "During this same visit, the attendant of Zinzendorf became acquainted with Anthony, a negro servant of Count de Laurwig, who told of the slaves in the West Indies, who had no one to tell them of the true God."<sup>8</sup> Anthony later visited Herrnhut and told his story. Two missions were begun in Greenland and one in the Indies as the beginning of the great work for the evangelizing of the heathen that has been the glory of the Moravians.

Owing to the doctrinal differences between Zinzendorf and the Lutheran authorities of Saxony, he was forbidden to preach in Saxony during the decade 1736-1747, although he had received instruction in theology at Tübingen and had been received into the Lutheran ministry in 1734. The period was given to itinerant labors for the kingdom of God. He visited Berlin where, meeting the favor of Frederick William I., and upon the advice of Archbishop Potter of Canterbury, he received episcopal ordination at the hands of Bishops Jablonski and Nitschmann, May, 1737. In January of that same year he had been in London where he met John and Charles Wesley. In 1738 he visited the West Indies. During 1741 and 1742 he labored in America, most of the time being spent in and around Philadelphia. While there he laid aside his title as being a hindrance to the work he hoped to accomplish among the German people. It seems never to have been his desire to establish a separate denomination, but rather to stimulate evangelical fervor within the Churches already established. The ideal which inspired his work in America, viz., of uniting the German people in Pennsylvania into one church without the dividing theological differences of the European schools, was a noble one. However the time

<sup>8</sup> *Ency. of Miss.*

was not ripe for such effort. Misunderstandings and jealousies and an injudicious zeal combined to defeat his purpose. "Zinzendorf's flaw of intellectual method, which inclined him to love paradoxical and mystic expressions and to build systems of thought around metaphors that temporarily fascinated him, had led to unwarranted sentimentalism in the prevalent conception of the atonement, set forth especially in hymns and liturgies."<sup>9</sup> Following his failure among the Germans he turned his efforts toward missions among the Indians.

With magnificent unselfishness he devoted his wealth to the advancement of the kingdom. His authority among the Moravians was unlimited in financial affairs, and he regarded every such obligation as his own. At his death the debts of the Church which he had assumed amounted to over \$700,000, and required many years to liquidate on the part of the Church. A characteristic story is told of his generosity in Duff's *English Hymns*. Upon his return to England from the West Indies, although personally weak, he gave up his stateroom to a Portugese Jew and his wife, who had sought help from the Count. "This protege, it must be added, waited on him faithfully, and, indeed, displayed nothing Jewish but his zeal for his religion." Upon the lifting of the ban against him in 1747, he returned to Herrnhut, where he lived until his death in 1760.

A ceaseless worker and voluminous writer, Zinzendorf has left his impress upon the Church, not through his writings, but through the example of his fervor and enthusiasm for practical Christian living and missionary labors. The Moravian Church, which resulted from his labors, has been the great missionary Church through all the years. Of the more than two thousand hymns which came from his pen very few survive today. Large numbers of them were extemporized and therefore lacked the quality that would enable them to live. Those known to English-speaking people have come through the translations and the paraphrases of John Wesley. They

<sup>9</sup> *Am. Ch. Hist.*, Vol. VIII., 457.

breathe an intense devotion and loyalty to Christ. When the edict banishing him from Saxony was issued he wrote in the following strain:

Glory to God, whose witness-train,  
Those heroes hold in faith,  
Could smile on poverty and pain,  
And triumph e'en in death.

Lord, if thine arm support us still  
With its eternal strength,  
We shall o'ercome the mightiest ill,  
And conquerors prove at length.

The entire Protestant Church has become imbued in one way or another with much of that fervor for missions which was so large a characteristic of this man. Indeed, as the Church is true to its cardinal doctrines which are embodied in what Zinzendorf termed the "theology of blood" will it manifest the same love and zeal. More and more also that other characteristic ideal of his labor is coming to prevail in the present day Protestant Church. We speak more of unity and of union than did the fathers of his day. We may yet learn to forget the differences of theology which divide us. Our songs of praise shall help to that end. With Zinzendorf men of all denominational shades of faith may join in the confession of Jesus Christ.

Jesus, Thy blood and righteousness  
My beauty are, my glorious dress;  
'Midst flaming worlds, in these arrayed,  
With joy shall I lift up my head.

TOLEDO, OHIO.